National Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment—Without Compromise.

S. H. GAY,
OLIVER JOHNSON, } Editors.

EDMUND QUINCY, Corresponding Editor

VOL. XIV. NO. 32. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1853. WHOLE NO. 708.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, on Saturday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 143 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK. Terms, *Two Dollars* per annum. Printed, for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by NORRIS & JOHNSTON, printers, No. 31 Spruce street, New York.

THE STANDARD.

ANTI-SLAVERY AGITATION IN CONGRESS.

[In the United States House of Representatives, on Tuesday, Dec. 20th (the House being in Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, and Mr. Houston having offered resolutions to refer the several portions of the President's Message to appropriate Committees), Hon. GERRIT SMITH made his first Congressional Speech. Taking for his text the President's allusion to the case of Martin Koszta, he expressed his disapproval of some things in the conduct of the Government upon that case, and showed how the alliance of the President and his Cabinet with a worse than Austrian Despotism at home made it impossible that they should maintain to the full extent the rights of Fugitives from foreign oppression, and turned all their professions in that regard into an empty mockery! He spoke with great ability and impressiveness. As he is writing out the Speech himself, we omit the *Daily Globe's* report of it, but copy its sketch of the debate that followed.]

Mr. Smith's Reply to Mr. Smith.

Mr. PRESTON, of Kentucky. I have listened, Mr. Chairman, not without a certain degree of interest, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Smith], who has just addressed the committee, and I now desire in a few words, by a brief response, though nothing could have been further from my intention than the design of offering any remarks to-day in relation to any subject that engages the legislative attention.

Living, as I do, in a State recognising Slavery, and firmly convinced, as I am, of the necessity of protecting our property in slaves, yet I do not desire to reply in any intolerant spirit to the views which the gentleman advanced by his colleague from New York. I feel conscious that the great and wise men who ushered our government into existence, and laid its foundations deep in truth and justice, were not inferior in religion or philanthropy to those who assail the rights of the Southern members of the Confederacy, assail their institutions, and decry their people. And although I may feel, with a strength of conviction that my language cannot adequately express, the injustice of assailing those rights, yet it is far from me to desire to evade or strangle discussion by denunciation or violence. I trust to the power of truth to show that the men of the South are not the representatives of a people enduring the odious tyranny that the gentleman asserts; that they are not men tolerating and fostering a wrong against every dictate of humanity and justice, but entertaining far wiser and more practical views than those misguided enthusiasts who would shake to its centre a Government planned by patriots and statesmen and cemented by the indelible powers.

Enthusiasm, sir, is respectable even in error. It is attractive when clothed in the fullness of appropriate language, and marked by eloquent delivery; but this should not blind us to the many unfortunate sentiments contained in the remarks we have heard. The gentleman from New York has sought to institute a parallel between the principles of Abolition and those contained in the letter of the Secretary of State to the Chevalier Hulsemann in relation to the surrender of Martin Koszta. To institute a comparison which would unite principles so dissimilar, would be to create a monster more hideous and more deformed than the Siamese twine in the physical world.

The sum of the doctrine in the Koszta letter, as asserted by the American flag, and protected Martin Koszta, having taken the initiatory steps to become a citizen in the United States, and having fled his dominion of intention in our courts, became clothed with such a nationality that, having gone into the city of Smyrna, in the peaceful pursuit of business or of pleasure, that he was still under the protection of the American flag, and could only recapture by the power of Austria. But, let me ask the gentleman, if a treaty had existed between Austria and the Government of the United States, by which the solemn faith of the American Government were pledged to restore such refugees, as we stipulate for the extradition of felons with Great Britain under the Ashburton treaty, whether, without a violation of faith, we could have refused to surrender the fugitive? There can be but one solution to the question. Yet, have not the States of the American Union something more solemn and more obligatory than a mere treaty to compel the extradition of fugitive slaves; something more than a compact, as Webster expounded it, in his memorable reply to Hayne; something more solemn and more binding than your compact—the Constitution itself—resting upon which our Government exists? A sovereign can recede from a treaty or a compact, and no tribunal on earth but itself can judge it; but in our Constitution—the most solemn form of obligation that society knows—a tribunal, the Supreme Court, is established to assist in the enforcement of the rights of the people composing the Confederacy. This Constitution, solemnly ratified, guarantees to the slaveholding States the protection of their property, and the extradition of fugitive slaves, when they escape into sister States where the institution is not recognised. Shall these solemn promises be fulfilled? or shall the pseudo-philanthropist, with the Bible in his hand—the Bible upon which the founders of our Government, and the two hundred and thirty-nine gentlemen now assembled, were sworn to support the Constitution—invoke our body to disregard its precepts, and commit meditated perjury by violating its provisions? Yet, such is the morality that is insisted on by gentlemen.

The logic of the Secretary of State has been assailed, upon the ground that he has chosen to place an unwarranted limitation upon the divine injunction that you should "do unto others as you would they should do unto you;" yet I would ask of the gentleman who has so keenly criticised the expression, if it is not a plain matter to an unsophisticated mind that it should fulfil the precise duties we make to others? and if, under this principle, the people of the North are not morally bound to fulfil their promises to their Southern brethren?

[A few moments remain unexpired of Martin Koszta, and the laws relating to it, the speaker proceeded.]

The gentleman from New York, Mr. Chairman, has not only criticised the letter of the Secretary, but has chosen to make this the occasion for a violent denunciation of the institution of Slavery in the Southern States. I know, sir, that the subject is trite and exhausted, but I feel unwilling that the reproach which he has uttered should pass without some reply.

The Southern States, since their earliest colonial history, have been peopled by two races of different colour and of different civilization. We hold them in bondage because we are unwilling to amalgamate with them, and desire to keep our Teutonic blood pure and uncorrupted by any baser admixture; because we prefer that their untutored labour should be directed by the superior intelligence of our race to useful industry, rather than that they should be freed from all wholesome restraint, and left without coercion to pollute our blood and destroy our progress. It is not within our comprehension to divine the cause which has made the Ruler of Nations establish this order of things.

The wisdom of man cannot foresee or penetrate the means by which the civilization of nations is directed by Him. We see ourselves surrounded by three millions of the African race, who, under the dominion of the white race, has in two hundred years made greater advances in religion and civilization than they have made in four thousand years in their aboriginal condition. If, at this hour, the angel of death were to breathe upon the face of our people, as it did upon the hosts of Senacherib, the surviving black race would exhibit a picture of civilization more remarkable than any that Africa has ever exhibited. But the African is not the only race which has been subject to Slavery. Eight hundred years since our boasted Saxons endured a Slavery as abject as that of the Southern negro. The history of all savage races who have attained the blessings of civilization shows that they have marched to freedom through the portals of Slavery. Where two races of widely different civilization exist together, the superior exterminate or enslave the inferior. The indocility of the Indian will cause him to be driven from the face of the earth. Slavery seems to be the price that ignorance pays to intelligence for its tuition in the arts of civilization.

Nothing can be more disastrous to a State than the permanent enfranchisement of an enslaved race. They gangrene upon the face of its society, until it perishes under the affliction. It is a singular historical fact, and worthy of note, that the first Abolitionist was the first person who introduced the African Slavery upon the shores of America. Las Casas, the Bishop of Chiapas, after Cortez conquered Mexico, felt the deepest compassion for the Indians who were the subjects of the philanthropy of Las Casas. The barriers which separated the races were cast down; the Castilian blood no longer ran pure and unpolluted in the veins of his people. The great preponderating element was engendered, and in whom will walk through the streets of Mexico will see all the horrid results of a debased amalgamated race, as he sees the Mexican of pure Spanish descent spurn from him with his foot, as he would some beast, the loathy Mestizo that obstructs the way.

But let me turn for a moment from a consideration of this question, and ask if our forefathers had framed the wise and beneficent government we enjoy to-day, morrow the Ohio were the military line of demarcation between the North and South, as the Rhine has been Germany and France; if forts were erected, custom-houses established, and armies created? If union were proposed to remedy all these evils, would it be accepted? If we were assembled as delegates, and the Union dissolved, upon what terms our Constitution guarantees, and the regulation of our own domestic institutions, can we for a moment doubt that, after all the benefits we have experienced, the North would be willing and anxious to accede to its provisions? Or would we of the South, forgetful of the gallant spirit of our forefathers who planted the Southern colonies, and whose descendants, mounting the crests of the illegitimate wave of civilization and religion into the primeval forests of the West, until they were borne over in Kentucky and Missouri, even to the golden shores of California, prove recreant to the glorious memories of the past, and submit to dishonourable dictation?

I respect the generosity of emotion that seems to move the gentleman from New York, decisively as I differ from every sentiment he utters; but I must say, that the Abolition of African Slavery and its agitation are fraught only with the most pernicious consequences to our common country. I live in a State in which the institution of Slavery exists, to which we have stood by our Southern brethren, and will stand by them in the defence of our rights; and that if Slavery be not perpetual, the hand of time will do more than the fulminations of legislation, the efforts of philanthropy or fanaticism. We may apply say, when we point to the ameliorations wrought already by time in the condition of our slaves,

"Quod nequit sol grand Divum promittere nemo
Auderet, volvenda dies en attutit ultro."

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that this subject may no longer be the subject of agitation; for I feel assured that, if it is continued, it will overwhelm the institutions we have inherited from our wise and patriotic ancestors in irretrievable ruin.

Mr. Dean in Reply to Mr. Smith.

DECEMBER 21, 1853.

Mr. DEAN, of New York, addressed the House as follows:

Mr. Chairman, having at an early day in the session given notice of my intention to offer some resolutions in relation to the case of Captain Ingraham, and having yesterday offered those resolutions, I stated at the time of offering them that I supposed they would lead to no debate. I myself did not desire to debate them, and they were referred to a committee without debate. But almost immediately after this occurrence, a colleague of mine [Mr. Sayre] commenced a debate upon the President's message, and referred directly to Captain Ingraham's conduct, and referred to it in a party aspect. Sir, I regret this deeply. I regret that, upon a question which I had supposed would have no party affinities—on a subject having reference to the conduct of an officer of our Navy, in relation to whom, I presume, not a man in the House knows to which party he belongs—I say I regret that a debate upon a subject of this kind, any attempt should be made to connect it with party. For, sir, I undertake to say, that the American people—the will of the entire American people—has been represented by the conduct of the Government; and I say here now, although we may be divided upon some questions; although, in the dispensation of offices, party lines must be observed to some extent, yet the President is the representative of the whole people, and not the representative of any party; and in this act, which has challenged the attention of all men of all parties, and, indeed, of the whole world, more than any other single occurrence of the last quarter of a century, the conduct of our Government, in sustaining its officers, has met the universal approval of every party in this country, and all classes of men throughout the world; and that the question which lies at the bottom involves a principle which should not be brought into the arena of party politics; and I thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PRESTON] for so gallantly coming forward and defending the conduct of Captain Ingraham and our Government in this affair.

Sir, I have come here to defend the Administration. I have nothing to do with that question now, and utterly disclaim any such motive; but I cannot permit a remark or two which my colleague from the Madison district [Mr. SMITH] made, yesterday, in reference to our Government, to pass unnoticed. The gentleman told this committee, and through the committee has published it to the world, that although I have to belong—I regret that the Government is a greater and a guiltier oppressor than even Austria—that the American Government, of which he forms a part, is a guiltier oppressor than Austria, and that the American people have no very high and existence to the slave power, and to the fact that it had been pledged in advance to that power.

Sir, upon that subject I shall avoid saying anything, except that I, in this Administration, am not being pledged to the slave power, or to any other power, is pledged only to those great principles which have been cherished and adopted by a vast majority of the American people, particularly in reference to the action of the Federal Government on the subject of Slavery in the States that have been understood for years, and affirmed and reaffirmed in every national convention for the last twelve years at any rate. They have adopted the doctrine that this Government was a confederacy of independent States formed for definite and specified purposes; that the powers of Congress are limited by the Constitution which created Congress; that the institution of Slavery in the States is a local institution, existing by virtue of municipal laws over which Congress has no control; that it existed at the time of the adoption of the Constitution; that, such being the case, Congress had nothing to do in its creation, or with its existence in any of the States of this Union.

Mr. GIDDINGS. Will the gentleman allow me a single moment to explain?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield the floor to any gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. DEAN. I must decline to do so. These interruptions are very inconvenient.

My colleague [Mr. Smith] said, yesterday, that this Government was a most guilty oppressor, even Austria; and, by way of illustrating the position that he took, he made use of a very strong simile, which I shall not here repeat. Mr. Chairman, were it not for the well-known intelligence of that gentleman—were it not that he is known, not only throughout New York, but throughout the whole United States, as a man not only of enlightened philanthropy and entire sincerity—as a gentleman, and also as a scholar possessing the very highest intelligence—I should be inclined to impute to him ignorance of the subject on which he spoke, to imagine that he could not have known the system of government which prevails in Austria, or he never would have made such an assertion. He could not have known that in Austria the will of one man is law. He could not have known that the present Emperor, Francis Joseph, has wrested from the people a constitution which they compelled him to give them, only four or five years ago, and that now the police are authorized to arrest, without warrant, and "imprison, any three men in Austria who may be found assembling together, and it is also well known that, to-day, *women*—women of the highest rank, women of education, women of the purest character; aye, *Christian* women—are pining in the dungeons of Austria, for no other crime than liberality. The gentleman certainly must have forgotten, in his zeal, the celebrated proclamation of Haynau, a portion of which I beg leave to read. It is the proclamation of July, 1849, and was addressed to the Hungarians who were then engaged in a revolution, which excited the warmest sympathy, not only of American people, but of every lover of freedom throughout the world. Haynau, in addressing them on that occasion, said:

"Although the greater majority of you are Germans by language and by habit, yet, led on by a rascally hero of words, you have participated in the criminal project of forming a Republic." * * "But I conjure to the magnanimity of my Emperor and master. Hatred, however, is odious to me, and I do not prize that which he keeps his word. Death will be visited, *without regard to condition or sex*, without delay, and on the spot where the deed is committed, upon every one: 1. Who attempts to assist the cause of the rebels, by word or deed, or by wearing revolutionary emblems. 2. Who dares to insult, by word or deed, one of my soldiers, or one of the troops of my brave allies. 3. Who enters into treasonable connections with the enemies of the Crown, and who attempts to kindle the spark of rebellion by malicious reports. 4. Who dares to secrete arms—as was, unfortunately, formerly the case—and does not deliver them during the space of time appointed by another proclamation of mine."

That proclamation, sir, ordered the death of every Hungarian who set up for a republican form of government, without regard to age or sex; and that proclamation did not proceed from Haynau; it was authorized by the Emperor of that country than which ours is said to be guiltier. But, sir, we need not go back to 1849. We have only to look at the position of Austria to-day in the struggle now going on between Turkey and Russia, which is a struggle for existence on the part of one of the acknowledged European nations. Austria, true to its instincts of despotism, refuses to allow the telegraph to be used for the purpose of transmitting intelligence of Turkish victories; liberty of the press does not exist there; and nobody is allowed to publish anything unless it is in favour of the government, and approved by its appointed censors. I say, therefore, that I must differ from my colleague when he attempts to institute a comparison between our Government and that, which is favourable to the latter. But, sir, I shall dispise that subject—it has no relevancy to the conduct of Captain Ingraham, or of our Government in sustaining him.

I desire now to call the attention of the committee for a few minutes to the reasons which influenced me in introducing the resolutions in relation to Captain Ingraham. They will speak for themselves for action in the House in a few days, and, as is often the case, there may then be no opportunity of debating them at all. I therefore ask the attention of the committee to the subject now.

The object of introducing these resolutions and passing them here is not for the purpose merely of glorifying Captain Ingraham, nor yet for the purpose of bestowing praise or censure upon any man this Administration; but it is simply as an act of justice to a man who, alone, thousands of miles from his country, has done his duty, and done it, too, resolute; and who, in the assertion of a great principle, has been victorious without the shedding of blood; and who, by his conduct, has maintained the great principle of American law, the right of expatriation, the right of every man to select his own place of residence, no matter where he may have been born. It is for such purposes alone that I shall show the world that American citizenship is worth possessing. Pass these resolutions, and you say to our people engaged in commerce, and travelling in whatever country, that American citizenship, when it is prize may lead them, there American valour will defend; and that there is no one entitled to the protection of our Government, no matter how insignificant he may be, but its whole power, if it is necessary, is at his command. And, sir, whether Koszta was a citizen, and entitled to protection as a citizen, or whether he was a mere stranger and sojourner, it matters not; he had a right to the protection of American law, and believe he was a proper subject for the exercise of power; it was exercised, and he was rescued; the principle was established, even if the person had no right to claim it is for others to do so. But we are told that he should not be protected because he was not a citizen, that he had only declared his intention to become such. I submit that citizenship has nothing to do with the question. The question is whether, when a man is entitled to the protection of the American flag by having resided in this country, and obtained a domicile here, or having declared his intention to become a citizen of these States, or by passport, or in any other way has placed himself in the situation of a subject, whether our brave naval officers are not to be sustained in affording it, even though they may be compelled to do it at the cannon's mouth. We have voted swords to Generals Scott and Taylor, and to other officers of our army, and unanimously. We are now called upon, and, in concert with the President, who had sustained Captain Ingraham, and the Secretary of the Navy—we being a co-ordinate and independent branch of the Government, the war-making power—to uphold the great principle involved. It is our duty to do so by some plain and explicit declaration, and I know of no more appropriate and emphatic manner of doing it than by adopting the resolutions that have been proposed.

Now, sir, I shall not go into any argument to justify Captain Ingraham. That has been done already by abler hands than mine. If any arguments were needed to sustain his conduct, arguments can be found them by reference to that world-renowned correspondence. If any precedents be needed, they are cited there; but no precedents, no arguments could make the case plainer. Our Government had acted before He made him a citizen; and one has only to refer to the heart that is within him to justify the act at Smyrna.

I shall detain the committee no longer, Mr. Chairman. I trust that whenever this matter comes before the House it will be promptly acted on, and that the resolutions will be unanimously passed, and go forth to the world to show that the American people are willing to sustain American officers in the defence of American rights, and the protection of American citizens, both native and adopted.

Speech of Mr. Giddings—Doctrine of the Free Democracy—the Amistad Case.

Mr. GIDDINGS. Until within the last five minutes I had no expectation of addressing the committee to-day, and I therefore come before you unprepared. I should not now have intruded myself upon the attention of the committee, except for some remarks which have just fallen from the gentleman opposite [Mr. Dean]. It is due to myself, sir, it is due to this body, and to the country, that the imputation which he has thrown out in regard to his colleague [Mr. Smith, of New York], and those who act with him, should be promptly met and exposed upon this floor. Nothing else, sir, would have drawn me from my seat. But when I hear a gentleman, either from deliberate intention or from misapprehension, misrepresent honourable gentlemen upon this floor, it is due to such gentlemen that they should be set right. I, and now, Mr. Chairman, I will be but one word in reply to the member who has just taken his seat before. I proceed to some other remarks, which I had intended for a future occasion. When the gentleman here represents that this Confederacy was a Confederacy of States, and that this body possesses no jurisdiction which has not been specifically delegated to it, he and I agree. It is the State-Right doctrine, in behalf of which, for seventeen years, I have contended; and when he says that this body has no right to interfere with Slavery, he and I stand together, where we both stood in 1840 [laughter].

Now I desire, in this place, before the country, to meet the imputation which he has thrown out here, that his colleague [Mr. Smith], and those who associate with his colleague, have called upon this Government to interfere with Slavery. Our position is directly and unqualifiedly the opposite of that doctrine. We have been claiming that this Government should wash its hands of Slavery; that it should purify itself from its contaminations, and leave it with the States, where the Constitution left it. We demand that it shall cease to interfere with it.

And now, in justice to that gentleman [Mr. Dean], and in order that he may set himself right, I call upon him to stand up here and tell this committee of an instance in which any man here—I care not which party—has ever called upon this Government to interfere with Slavery. He has represented us as doing that, and I call upon him now to back his imputation, to meet it like a man, before this body, and before the nation; or else shrink from his position and dodge it. And now, sir, I await the obloquy of that gentleman.

[Cries of "Go on!" "Go on!"]

Mr. GIDDINGS (resuming). No, sir; I say to that gentleman, and to this House, that the day has arrived when we have the public ear, and the people of this nation are no longer to be deceived and misled. A hundred and fifty presses will bear to the whole North this exposure of his misrepresentation; that we are trying to interfere with Slavery in the States, where it constitutionally exists. When that gentleman, upon this floor, deliberately puts to silence all a gitation of this subject, and maintains a commerce in the bodies of women in this District, degrading it with every influence it can put forth—he and his colleague—he

her the relations which subsisted under the laws of the Government from which she sailed; or, as was intended, the relations of master and slaves; may be carried by a slave ship into Connecticut, New York, or New London; and that the slave dealer shall have the right to whip his slaves, to cut them overboard, or shoot them, as they would under the laws of a slave-dealing nation from which she sailed. This was done by a vote of the Senate, and it is quoted as evidence of the law of nations. While I would speak respectfully of that body, it becomes me to speak of them with perfect plainness and perfect sincerity.

Now, these resolutions of 1840, which are quoted as evidence of the law of nations, were *manufactured to order*. The American slave ship Enterprise was driven, from stress of weather, into the port of Hamilton, in the Island of Bermuda; when she arrived, under the operation of British laws, the slaves were of course free. And the slave-dealers interested in the cargo called upon the executive to demand of the British Government compensation. The Government referred to the law of nations, by which a ship coming within the jurisdiction of a friendly nation becomes subject to her laws. And such is the case as regards our own coast, and the coast of every other civilized nation in the world. Our jurisdiction extends over the whole country, over our rivers and bays and gulfs, and for the distance of a marine league into the ocean. When a ship comes within a marine league of our shore, our revenue officers board her in the discharge of their duties, our health officers investigate the condition of her "bill of health," our pilots conduct her into port, and receive their compensation for the same, and whatever questions arise as to acts committed on board the vessel are decided according to the laws which regulate the port at which she arrives.

To change this rule of international law, the Senate of the United States passed resolutions which held the law to be different. That body attempted to modify, to repeal the law to which I have referred. The resolutions were brought up—and now I wish to address myself to Whigs. And such I remember when I say *not a Whig north of Mason and Dixon's line dared vote one way or the other*. They dodged the question. They dared not take any position at all. To not understand as an intelligent people are in want of respect for those men who fled. I despise the act, while I honour the men—as some Whigs stuck to General Scott, while they despised and spit upon the platform on which he stood. I speak of it as a matter of history, to go upon the record of the nation, to be known throughout the length and breadth of the land, that men intrusted with the interest of the nation dared not show their hands, dared not vote either for or against these propositions, with the exception of one man from the State of Rhode Island—and I like to see men honest and bold even in their devilry; that gentleman stood up and voted for the resolution [laughter.]

The resolution was passed; and it was there determined that the law of nations was repealed, modified, moulded into slaveholding shape. But lo and behold! the next day the sun rose in the east and set in the west; and when the next storm swept our coast, every Swedish and French and British vessel making our ports, was subjected to our jurisdiction, and our laws were enforced on board of them. So it was with our vessels which were driven into the ports of other nations. They were treated in the same manner; and one would suppose that these foreign nations never heard of our Senate's having repealed and modified the law of nations. Yet this report is based upon such a resolution!

If I had time, I could go back to the year previous, when Captain Wendell with his ship from Boston [I think], while in the port of Havana, was taken by Spanish authorities, and thrown under Spanish authorities, and punished by Spanish laws.

The year following arose the case of the brig Creole, a slave ship from Richmond, Virginia, in which, being within twenty-four hours' sail of New Orleans with her cargo of slaves, when they rose upon their keepers, asserted their right to freedom in spite of the piratical slave-dealers having them in charge, one of whom they laid low in death. I ask as you, Mr. Chairman, and I would have done—just as every man would do who has the heart and feelings of a man—just as Washington and his compatriots did when they cast off the oppression of the mother Government. They went into Nassau, in the island of New Providence, and, of course, being under British laws, were free.

The parenthetical administration of John Tyler called on the British Government to pay for them. The letter of Secretary Webster, giving instructions to our Minister at the Court of St. James, was published. It seemed to pledge the influence of the nation to the support of the slave trade.

In this hall they were met by resolutions denying such power. The British individual [meaning who them was driven from his seat here; but by that act the country was aroused. The attention of the people was called to the subject. The public press spoke out, and that demand upon the British Government was dropped. Can any man tell me what has become of it? Can my friend from Virginia [Mr. Bayly], the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, tell me how much that Government paid for the slaves?

Mr. Bayly. I can inform the gentleman, if he will yield me the floor!

Mr. Giddings. I will yield for a categorical answer. I do not like to yield the floor now for remarks; but I hope he will reply at length, as soon as he gets the floor. It was a matter of public excitement of this nation was heard, that Mr. Webster himself backed out of the position assumed in his letter of instructions; and neither Whig nor Democratic Administration has ever dared to call upon Polk, General Taylor, and Millard Fillmore never again demanded compensation for those slaves; and when Daniel Webster came back to the office of Secretary of State in the next Administration, he was never heard to advocate this claim, or demand restitution of the British Government. If I am in error, I hope the gentleman from Virginia will correct me. I may be wrong, but I give it as that which I have heard it. I have made the assertion before upon this floor, and gentlemen have gone to the Departments with a view of ascertaining the facts, and have come back satisfied with the truth of my statement. There may be some recent action upon this subject of which I am ignorant. If so, I hope the gentleman will set me right. I hope he will inform us what Administration has ever called on this infamous demand upon the British Government, for compensation for the bones, and blood, and muscles of American born subjects? If so, let the fact go forth to the people of this nation, and let them understand distinctly who it is that seeks to involve them in the crimes, iniquities, and unutterable guilt of dealing in human flesh.

I have hurried over the subject much more rapidly than I intended to do, and have not alluded to many points to which I wished to direct the attention of the Committee. I think it best now to write out my remarks, I will supply those omissions. I will only say at this time, in conclusion, that the part of the President's message in which reference is made to the Ostend affair, is regarded by the Northern section of the country, and that part relating to the Kozsta affair was doubtless intended for the advocates of freedom. The question of Slavery has become the great overwhelming, overpowering, and absorbing issue which now agitates the people throughout the length and breadth of this land. The only question before the American nation is, shall the powers of this government be perverted to the maintenance of Slavery and the slave trade, or shall they be appropriated to the maintenance of the rights of human liberty?

Those Africans, while sailing on board the Amistad, breathing the pure air of heaven, felt an elevation felt when he declared that "all men were created free and equal." They felt as our fathers felt when they asserted, in the face of the civilized world, that "all men are endowed by their Creator with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and happiness." To condemn these, is to condemn Washington, Warren, and every patriot of the Revolution. To condemn them, is to condemn the whole page of history every patriot who has heretofore struggled for freedom.

Now let me again repeat to my friend from New York [Mr. Dean] that his colleague [Mr. Smith] made no allusions, that I was able to discover, to any political parties, but I do allude to them; and let me say, that every member here is arrayed upon the side of freedom or oppression. Those Africans when they felt the immortal spirit of freedom stirring within them, raised their arms in the same spirit that animated the heroes of the Revolution; and they struck for liberty, and God in his mercy has succeeded in obtaining it! They saw on yonder continent their beloved homes, their country, their kindred, and their friends, from whom they had been ruthlessly torn by Spanish pirates. Who will vote for compensation to these Spanish slave-dealers, to pay them for their loss of anticipated speculation in human flesh, from the hard earnings of northern freemen? Following the instincts to which I have alluded, these Africans took possession of the ship, it was a lawful prize. They were at war with the pirates who held them in subjection. And they maintained those rights when they came into possession of the ship. No vessel captured by the Americans in the late war with England was more morally or properly obtained than the Amistad. They had a perfect right to demand of Nalis and Montez that they should take them back to Africa. These men with the entire understanding and knowledge that they were imported slaves, thereby became participators in the guilt of the original importers; and the carrying of the Africans to Principe was as great a crime as the taking them originally from Africa. They were as guilty as those who brought them into this country, and deserved at the hands of civilized men the gallows as much as ever pirates deserved that punishment. If we, as a nation, hold that men are guilty of piracy who deal in human flesh, and when they shall be arraigned in that guilt, that they are unfit for human association and worthy of death at the yard-arm of our men-of-war, shall we relax that rule in this case, and instead of manacling, here gallows to Rain and Montez pay them for their crimes?

Gentlemen, give your votes frankly; and if the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will call the roll, let the yeas and nays go upon the record; let northern gentlemen record their names in favour of paying these Spanish pirates for their misfortunes in slaves lost, and let the whole world know it. Let that record be published throughout the country, and show who were in favour of such a bill, and who against it.

But, sir, I leave this subject to the decision of that great tribunal, the people. They will take care of the issue and decide it for themselves. For sixteen years I have witnessed in these Halls, the progress of this issue between Liberty and Slavery; and let me say that it stands more prominent and more powerful to-day here, and throughout the country, than at any former period. Most heartily do I thank the President elect for his noble and manly sentiments in his late speech, that slave dealers so prominently before the nation—before the people. I thank him for presenting an opportunity for its discussion.

The result of the discussions of these subjects has always been to drive men to take their positions with reference to Slavery; but no question is better calculated to do that than this issue. It compels the representative to speak his true sentiments, to unveiled to the scrutiny of their constituents, and to the scrutiny of the country. Sir, I thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Bayly] for the intimation he has given, that he will not call up a bill for our action. Let him bring it before us; let it be discussed here; and let us decide the question, whether we will or will not pay the losses of these Spanish pirates. Let each member decide the question for himself, as he feels willing to answer to his people.

And now let me say, as was so beautifully expressed yesterday, that in that future day, when we must each and every one of us stand before that dread tribunal which awaits us in the future, when our acts and words will be examined, here and there can then be no shrinking behind the Administration. Those fugitive slave enactments, passed in violation of God's laws, will not shelter you nor me for violating the law of our Creator, or for trampling under our feet the laws of our Creator.

Mr. Walsh obtained the floor.

Mr. Bayly, of Virginia. I ask the gentleman from New York to yield me the floor a moment for the purpose of explanation!

Mr. Walsh. I will yield for a moment.

Mr. Bayly. I desire, then, to say that the speech just made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Giddings] is full of errors, both of law and of fact; errors which, at some future time, will be exposed.

Mr. Giddings. No threats. No threats.

Mr. Bayly. I do not intend to use any threats. I only want to ask that the House will not prejudge the merits of this case; for, I repeat, that the argument so elaborately gone into by the gentleman from Ohio is full of errors, both of law and of fact.

Mr. Giddings. Which I suppose the gentleman will pledge himself to show.

Mr. Bayly. Yes, sir, I pledge myself to show it when the opportunity shall present itself.

Mr. Jones, of Tennessee. I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. Walsh], who holds the floor, to give way for a motion that the committee rise.

Mr. Giddings. I ask the gentleman to allow me a moment for personal explanation.

Mr. Walsh. I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to take no part in the discussion of the question now before the committee, and I should not have troubled the House with a word, but for the remarks which have been made by the gentleman from Ohio, who has just taken his seat, viz: that a statement made by a former member from the city of Philadelphia was a deliberate and wilful misrepresentation of fact.

Mr. Giddings. I did not say precisely that. I said that I considered it as such, and that I would produce facts to prove that it was such.

Mr. Chairman, I myself was a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in 1844, and knowing who was the representative of the *city* of Philadelphia at that time, I felt anxious to ascertain a word with reference to the remarks of his predecessor. I now understand that reference was had, not to that gentleman, but to his kinsman, who then represented a district in the interior of the county, adjoining that which is contained in the city.

The reference, however, is to a gentleman and a scholar, whose fault of being a Democrat of course I condemn most heartily; and I do differ from him on the subject of Abolition, I am willing to accord them all the merit and honour that flow from a somewhat overgrown philanthropy, if he feels disposed to indulge them in that philanthropy, at the fearful expense of degrading the honour of my country and my country's flag. I cannot allow him to make such charges with the least grain of allowance. I had supposed, as I remarked a moment ago, that this question of Abolition was dead. I supposed it had no hold upon the country at this time even a god-father to stand by it in its extremity. Both the Whig and Democratic conventions, which met at Baltimore, some eight months ago, ruled the question of Abolition as effectually out of existence as the Austrian Government, of which the gentleman has just spoken, has ruled out of existence the prostrate, dismembered Poland. Upon neither of the Baltimore platforms of the two great parties of this Union dared a hydra-headed monster enter. At this day I do not think there is respectable number to be made in the presence of so many new members—without expressing dissent. The statements and arguments of the report mentioned may be errorneous in fact, but I cannot think that it is right, in the absence of the author, to designate them as wilful misrepresentations. The discrepancies mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio, as occurring in the report, are too patent to warrant any supposition of intended error.

Mr. Florence. And no other gentleman from Pennsylvania on this floor would willingly state what he believed to be untrue.

Mr. Giddings. I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. Walsh] will favour me with the floor for one moment. I trust he will extend to me the same courtesy he extended to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Chairman. Will the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. Walsh. I feel under an obligation to decline the request.

[Loud cries of "Go on!" "Go on!"]

Speech of Mike Walsh.

Mr. Walsh. I had intended to make some remarks at length on this question, but I have too much regard for the feelings of an already exhausted House, and much respect for myself, to indulge in those remarks to-day.

I am not so desirous of making a speech that I will attempt to do so now, but shall confine myself to one or two suggestions in regard to the course which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Giddings] has undertaken to-day. Among theologians, as a general thing, when a man undertakes to be pious, when he gets what, in theological parlance, is called religion, he goes into it body and soul, and is ready and for, and encouraged. He is not repelled and repulsed. And when one of my Soft friends from New York, who is in what may be said to be a chrysalis state of Abolitionism, and is undergoing softening and becoming encouraged by the regularly-avowed Abolitionists, might be soon found, after the Patronage of the President is entirely disposed of, and all the inducements for such a belle and falsely their humanity have passed—I say, when such men might be found gradually softening until they are dissolved in the political cess-pool of their Abolitionism, I think it is at least impolitic, not to say ungenerous, on the part of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Giddings] to have met these attempts which the Softs of New York have been so studiously making when freed from the contaminating influence of political partisans to renew the coalition which they once formed with them in 1848 [laughter]. Now, sir, the other day a couple of gentlemen stood upon this floor gratuitously to vindicate an Administration which has not been assailed in this House. They thought to draw the tree men of New York from their position into an attack upon that Administration—which they never have contemplated; but we have proved ourselves too good tacticians to be caught by that dodge. It was not a little strange, it was not a little curious, that this gratuitous, but uncalled-for defence of the Administration, should have come from men—the one a Free Soiler and the other a Whig—both opposed to the principles on which Franklin Pierce was whirled into the White House. Sir, when the time comes—and it has not come yet—New York will utter her voice; but, thus far, I, and those who co-operate with me, have sat in our seats like orderly and respectable citizens, and like quite and sincere Christians [laughter].

We have sat still and watched and prayed, and the result of it has been a beautiful quarrel between the Abolitionists of the strongest grade and the incipient Abolitionists—a quarrel which I have no disposition to spoil [laughter]. But, sir, let me tell the House that when the time does come for New York to speak—when the time arrives for the *true* Democracy of New York to tell the Administration, or this House, or the country, what they think of it, of course, New York will speak in language that will admit of no two interpretations. New York will speak in language that nobody will misunderstand. Until that happy day arrives, I will content myself with returning to my quiet and orderly position [laughter].

Speech of Mr. Wright, of Pa.

Thursday, Dec 22, 1843.

The House being in Committee of the Whole,

Mr. Wright, of Pennsylvania, spoke as follows:

The opening of the session, and the commencement of this session has taken a somewhat unusual course. I do not think that the country at large was prepared to anticipate the results, with regard to the opening debates of this House, that we have realized within the last two or three days. I am one of those who think, that, after the great contests the country has so recently passed through, when both the great political parties of the nation seemed to have concluded this question was dead, and when the Democratic party had won victory won—I say, I am one of those who believed that Abolitionism was dead and buried; and until the day that the gentleman from Ohio introduced his bill, York [Mr. Smith] exhumed its lifeless body, and dragged it again before this House and the country, I supposed that it was the general belief that the spirit of Abolitionism, like a ghost in this Hall, and before the country. I do not propose to go into a discussion of the abstract question of Abolition. Wiser heads than mine have already settled that question. The discussion of that subject, until it has not a limb left to its body that is not completely mutilated. Perpetual, that at this moment it is living, and reanimated with the energies and power of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Smith] cannot resuscitate its putrid carcass.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I may be able to reply to an argument on the subject of Abolition in this Hall. I know that a large portion of the Democratic party in this House are opposed to the discussion of the abstract question of Abolition. They think, as a great portion of their party thought, that no notice whatever should have been paid to it; that it should be allowed to sink into its original nothingness. I am one of those who think that to bring before the country a question which is fraught with so much evil to the country as that subject is, and would be, if ever seriously agitated in Congress, Mr. Chairman, I never can sit in an American Congress with my mouth closed, and hear doctrines advanced such as were uttered on the day before yesterday, by the gentleman from New York. I refer you, sir, and members of this House, to a single paragraph in the reported speech of that gentleman, and I hope I may have the indulgence of the House of the committee, while I read the paragraph to which I have referred.

That there may be no mistake, sir, I will read the paragraph:

"I admit that Austria is an oppressor; but is it not equally and more glaringly true that America is a living practical guilty oppressor? Indeed, Austrian despotism, compared with our despotism, which chases millions of men, women, and children, with cubic, is but as the little finger to the loins."

And the gentleman placed his hands on his body as he made use of the expression. Now, sir, when I was told, in a high place, that the greater despotism in America—free, independent, powerful and gigantic as she is—than that of Austria, which is a prostrate power here than there is in that degraded Austrian empire, I cannot repress my feelings, nor can I permit such talk to go out to the country, without a word of explanation and without, a reprimand, I care not from what source it emanates or who utters it. Sir, that work of exaggerated fiction which has done more harm to the cause of humanity, called "Uncle Tom's Cabin," written by Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, the object of which was to impair and diminish the character, the power, the importance, and the value of the Union, and to create a feeling in the minds of the people of this country, which is a stigmatize his own country, it is time for patriotic men to speak, and to speak openly. The gentleman eulogizes that Government for the part it played, in connection with a combination with Russia and Prussia to blot from the chart of nations the nationality of Poland, and took her share of the spoils of the division.

There was no despotism, sir, in that act! The gentleman from New York, standing in his place in the American Congress, stigmatizes the Union, which a few years after, not only trampled upon fifteen millions of Hungarians, but made them worse slaves than the slaves of the American Union! And, sir, I suppose, there was no despotism! The gentleman is the apologist of a State where the public press is entirely abolished and where—as we suppose, as all must suppose—the processes, and where the people at this day are in a more degraded condition than perhaps any other people upon the continent of Europe. And that is the country where, according to the gentleman from New York, the despotism is interior to the despotism of this great and mighty Union! The gentleman from New York speaks of a certain General Haynau, I think his name was, who, commanding an Austrian army upon Hungarian territory, butchered the slaughtered the indistrimately men, women, and children; and does he come within the broad terms of the eulogy that the honourable gentleman from New York [Mr. Smith] has given, in his remarks, in human form, and whose only passion seemed to have been to know how much blood would flow from Hungarian veins. And, sir, I think that the predecessor, I now understand that reference was had, not to that gentleman, but to his kinsman, who then represented a district in the interior of the county, adjoining that which is contained in the city.

The reference, however, is to a gentleman and a scholar, whose fault of being a Democrat of course I condemn most heartily; and I do differ from him on the subject of Abolition, I am willing to accord them all the merit and honour that flow from a somewhat overgrown philanthropy, if he feels disposed to indulge them in that philanthropy, at the fearful expense of degrading the honour of my country and my country's flag. I cannot allow him to make such charges with the least grain of allowance. I had supposed, as I remarked a moment ago, that this question of Abolition was dead. I supposed it had no hold upon the country at this time even a god-father to stand by it in its extremity. Both the Whig and Democratic conventions, which met at Baltimore, some eight months ago, ruled the question of Abolition as effectually out of existence as the Austrian Government, of which the gentleman has just spoken, has ruled out of existence the prostrate, dismembered Poland. Upon neither of the Baltimore platforms of the two great parties of this Union dared a hydra-headed monster enter. At this day I do not think there is respectable number to be made in the presence of so many new members—without expressing dissent. The statements and arguments of the report mentioned may be erroneous in fact, but I cannot think that it is right, in the absence of the author, to designate them as wilful misrepresentations. The discrepancies mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio, as occurring in the report, are too patent to warrant any supposition of intended error.

Mr. Florence. And no other gentleman from Pennsylvania on this floor would willingly state what he believed to be untrue.

Mr. Giddings. I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. Walsh] will favour me with the floor for one moment. I trust he will extend to me the same courtesy he extended to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Chairman. Will the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. Walsh. I feel under an obligation to decline the request.

[Loud cries of "Go on!" "Go on!"]

Speech of Mike Walsh.

Mr. Walsh. I had intended to make some remarks at length on this question, but I have too much regard for the feelings of an already exhausted House, and much respect for myself, to indulge in those remarks to-day.

I am not so desirous of making a speech that I will attempt to do so now, but shall confine myself to one or two suggestions in regard to the course which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Giddings] has undertaken to-day. Among theologians, as a general thing, when a man undertakes to be pious, when he gets what, in theological parlance, is called religion, he goes into it body and soul, and is ready and for, and encouraged. He is not repelled and repulsed. And when one of my Soft friends from New York, who is in what may be said to be a chrysalis state of Abolitionism, and is undergoing softening and becoming encouraged by the regularly-avowed Abolitionists, might be soon found, after the Patronage of the President is entirely disposed of, and all the inducements for such a belle and falsely their humanity have passed—I say, when such men might be found gradually softening until they are dissolved in the political cess-pool of their Abolitionism, I think it is at least impolitic, not to say ungenerous, on the part of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Giddings] to have met these attempts which the Softs of New York have been so studiously making when freed from the contaminating influence of political partisans to renew the coalition which they once formed with them in 1848 [laughter]. Now, sir, the other day a couple of gentlemen stood upon this floor gratuitously to vindicate an Administration which has not been assailed in this House. They thought to draw the tree men of New York from their position into an attack upon that Administration—which they never have contemplated; but we have proved ourselves too good tacticians to be caught by that dodge. It was not a little strange, it was not a little curious, that this gratuitous, but uncalled-for defence of the Administration, should have come from men—the one a Free Soiler and the other a Whig—both opposed to the principles on which Franklin Pierce was whirled into the White House. Sir, when the time comes—and it has not come yet—New York will utter her voice; but, thus far, I, and those who co-operate with me, have sat in our seats like orderly and respectable citizens, and like quite and sincere Christians [laughter].

We have sat still and watched and prayed, and

at this time, it may be a question admitting of some considerable doubt; his zeal and discretion are by no means evenly matched.

Now, Mr. Chairman, having disposed of that part of the speech which refers to the despotism of this country, I want the committee to bear with me until I make reference to another quotation from the gentleman's address, and which is in keeping with what I have already read and stated to the House. I find this paragraph:

"*Alas! sir, what a pitiable spectacle does our Administration present in thus wilfully corrupting Christianity, for the sake of sorting to a low, and abominable, a thing as Slavery! And then, sir, what a pitiable spectacle do the American people present in choosing such an Administration, and in remaining patient under it!*"

In the estimation of that gentleman, this Administration, indorsing these measures of compromise, after they had been solemnly ratified before the world by the dominant parties in the United States, upon their respective platforms at Baltimore, presents to the country "a pitiable spectacle, and abominable a thing as Slavery." For its observance of the law? "Corrupting Christianity to the Constitution? For doing right in the face of Heaven and man? Does the gentleman from New York pay due respect to the Constitution of the United States? I assume, sir, that he has been sworn as a member of this body, and, having been sworn, I want to refer him to a single clause in the Constitution of the United States, which I will read from the 8d clause, section 2d, and article 4:

"No person held to service or labour in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labour, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labour may be due."

Then I desire to propound to the gentleman a question: How, in accordance with that clause in the Constitution of our country, can he stand up here on what case of a law that is superior to the Constitution itself?

The gentleman is a renowned and distinguished lawyer, and I have heard him read that Constitution time and time again. How, then, let me ask him, can he, as a constituent part of this legislative body, put himself in opposition to the plainest provisions of that Constitution, upon the Holy Evangelists, and support the written Constitution of the country, and, at the same time, be the advocate here of a principle which he declares is higher law than the Constitution of his country? I know not with regard to the military regulations, with regard to questions of government, that should be superior, that is superior to the written Constitution of the country. Sir, I think I shall never come, in this country, when higher law shall be used as a substitute for the written law. God forbid that such a day shall ever arrive! Millions will enjoy the blessings of free institutions with us.

Mr. Smith, of New York. Will the gentleman yield me the floor for a few minutes?

Mr. Wright. Does the gentleman desire to make a speech?

Mr. Smith. I rose not because I wish to reply to the gentleman's question, for I do not wish to reply to it. But, as he put the question to me, and might deem silence in the House as evidence of my inability to reply to it; and I trust that the gentleman will feel no better after my reply.

Mr. Wright. After having called the gentleman out, I cannot refuse him the floor.

Mr. Smith. The gentleman has referred me to that clause of the Constitution which respects fugitives from labour; and it is on that clause that my question is based. Now not to consume the time of the gentleman with any other reason for my denying that the slave is property in the Constitution of the United States, I will only advert to the fact, that three days previous to the close of the convention which framed the Constitution, the committee on style made their report; and in that report, in a strike out, they struck out the word "slave," and to supply its place with the word "service." This substitution was made by a *unanimous* vote, and for the very reason that "service" is applicable to a condition of slaves, and "service" the condition of freemen. I hold, therefore, that the word "service" in the Constitution refers to freemen, and to freemen only. To hold that the framers of the Constitution did after the substitution I have referred to, mean that the word service should refer to those held to service time them with hypocrisy. I add that the facts I have here given, may be found in the Madison papers.

Mr. Wright. That is not my construction of those papers. The very language of which the gentleman has read was made upon the suggestion of a Southern member of that body, who thought it would be better not to introduce the word "slave" into the Constitution, as there is no such word in any other known code of laws, and made a few commentaries upon what the gentleman from New York has asserted to himself it to order.

[The remarks of Mr. Wright, in reply to the speech related to other topics, and was of no special interest.]

Speech of Mr. Phillips, of Alabama.

Friday, Dec. 23.

The House being again in Committee of the Whole,

Mr. Phillips, of Alabama, said, the question before the committee was the reference of the President's message; and yet, from the latitude of debate, not only had the principles of the message been involved, but the question of Slavery, in connection with the Texas Annexation, the Ostend affair, and the constitutionality of the act of 1850, which invested in the Secretary of the Treasury the appointment of a slave-catching corps. And whatever else was to be involved in the discussion, or on what other unknown sea they were yet to be launched, no one could tell; not even that notorious person, the "oldest inhabitant."

He could not say that he was surprised by the sentiments which fell from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Smith], and from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Giddings], though he confessed the sentiments in themselves were startling and novel. But he was not surprised, because those stereotyped sentimentalities which issue from the lips of Abolitionists had fallen on ears open to receive and drink in with delight the least emotion of surprise. Invective, unmeasured and unsparing abuse, had been poured out by the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, and those members have maintained their seats in quiet, in decorum, and without reply. Nay, more, they had been called on to withdraw the remarks of those who, denying the obligation of their constitutional oath, could falsify history and the plain provisions of the Constitution to support and sustain them in the violation of their pledged faith.

This institution of Slavery had been inherited. It was sacred to him by the Federal compact. He would call on himself to defend it, and on every other inherited object of those gentlemen: that they might establish the place as the centre from which they may spread their fair arrows to every section of the Union to light up a flame of discord. When the Constitution shall fail to secure Southern rights, for which it was ordained, it was strong in the expression of its duties, and restraints, which the law imposes. But the sword of Captain Ingraham and the pen of Secretary Marcy are destined to joint immortality.

[From this point the debate turned upon other topics.]

SKETCH OF MR. PALFREY'S LECTURE.

The Second Lecture in the Course of the New York Anti-Slavery Society was delivered in the Broadway Tabernacle, December 20th.

Mr. Palfrey commenced by stating that unless he read the origins of the Constitution, he was in great danger in this country of losing altogether the benefits which had been secured to us in the past. When we spoke of the Constitution, as it was now interpreted, the iron military despotism was referred to, under which there was no protection to life, liberty or property. Such was the case, if the objectionable law of Captain Ingraham and the pen of Secretary Marcy are destined to joint immortality.

What shall I say in reply to his observations? Do not let the gentleman suppose that I am putting the question now with the view of obtaining from him an immediate answer [a laugh] I know he is always ready; and will, perhaps, answer at much greater length than I would be willing he should in view of the time allotted me under the rules. By no means let him suppose it [laughter].

Mr. Giddings. Then I will answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he desires it.

Mr. Wright. Not at all, at present [renewed laughter] I pay deference at all times to age, and the gentleman is very old. I say, respectfully, many years the junior—at least, such is my impression when I look at the two gentlemen in their seats. But what shall I say to the gentleman from Ohio? He used very hard talk yesterday, when he said that every man north of Mason and Dixon's line was a "dough-face." I would ask the gentleman a question, and will not object to a categorical answer. I would ask him if he lives north of Mason and Dixon's line?

Mr. Giddings. I do.

Mr. Wright. Then, according to the gentleman's own assertion, he is himself a "dough-face" [great laughter]. He is in the same catalogue he places the rest of us. I am very humble.

Sir, the speech that the gentleman from Ohio made yesterday I have heard time after time, and again and again, during the last ten years. It is a stereotyped edition, and as the country is bound to be afflicted with it annually, and as we were to have a repetition of it this session, as we have had in former sessions, it was just as well that he should put it to press at once, and send it out at this early stage. It was all ready.

Now, as the gentleman has designated every man who resides north of Mason and Dixon's line as a "dough-face," I would ask——

Mr. Giddings. I hope now that the gentleman will allow me to explain.

Mr. Wright. No, no; I cannot. I am afraid the gentleman from Ohio will occupy more of my time than I could be willing to allow; and I do not desire the hour the committee allows me to be filled up with principles and doctrines I abhor.

The gentleman having made this remark in regard to "dough-faces," I merely wanted to make an allusion to it. As to the substance of what he said yesterday, it has been said over and over again in the halls of the United States, that I pass it by, even without a single solitary remark. It is not my purpose to give the gentleman a lecture preceding his speech.

I desire now to refer the House, and particularly the gentleman from New York, to the concluding sentence of the great speech which was made by Daniel Webster in the other branch of this legislative body, on the subject of the compromise measures. I desire the gentleman from New York to listen to the quotation from the speech of that great statesman. Mr. Webster says in that speech:

"No monarchical throne presses these States together; no iron chain of despotic power encircles them: they live and spread over their vast territory as free men. Their relation is that of a voluntary association, founded on principles of equality, and calculated to advance the happiness of those who compose it. Unity and happiness! It has been said that a single solitary thread is sufficient to bind a bird to the centre, but that a number, however small, will have that effect. Let us bind the States together by all the ties of affection, of interest, and of duty, and they will be forever safe and happy. In all the quarrels and contentions that have distracted the world, no one has ever arisen among us which could not be traced to the usurpation of the general government, or to the abuse of its powers. Let us keep within the limits of our respective jurisdictions, and the general government will be felt only in its beneficent operations. Like the unseen and unfelt operations of the air, which we breathe in and breathe out, it will be known and felt only by its results. While the States maintain their sovereignty in their proper spheres, the general government will command the love and respect of the world. We shall be known and read of all men, and our example will be the means of attracting the love of the friends of liberty everywhere. Attempt to maintain it by force, and you will keep down the spirit and break up the forms of liberty. It will be in vain to seek to establish a general government over unwilling States, with any degree of vigour, or any duration. Leave the States to their own laws and their own sense of propriety, and the general government will be upheld by the affections of the people. Here is the true secret of our past success, and of our present and future security. Here is the great principle which recommends our system to the favour of mankind; and if we maintain it, pure and unadulterated, as we received it, we shall be the guardians of the world's liberties, and the asylum of the human race for ages to come. And, sir, what a pitiable spectacle do the American people present in choosing such an Administration, and in remaining patient under it!"

In the estimation of that gentleman, this Administration, indorsing these measures of compromise, after they had been solemnly ratified before the world by the dominant parties in the United States, upon their respective platforms at Baltimore, presents to the country "a pitiable spectacle, and abominable a thing as Slavery." For its observance of the law? "Corrupting Christianity to the Constitution? For doing right in the face of Heaven and man? Does the gentleman from New York pay due respect to the Constitution of the United States? I assume, sir, that he has been sworn as a member of this body, and, having been sworn, I want to refer him to a single clause in the Constitution of the United States, which I will read from the 8d clause, section 2d, and article 4:

"No person held to service or labour in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labour, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labour may be due."

Then I desire to propound to the gentleman a question: How, in accordance with that clause in the Constitution of our country, can he stand up here on what case of a law that is superior to the Constitution itself?

The gentleman is a renowned and distinguished lawyer, and I have heard him read that Constitution time and time again. How, then, let me ask him, can he, as a constituent part of this legislative body, put himself in opposition to the plainest provisions of that Constitution, upon the Holy Evangelists, and support the written Constitution of the country, and, at the same time, be the advocate here of a principle which he declares is higher law than the Constitution of his country? I know not with regard to the military regulations, with regard to questions of government, that should be superior, that is superior to the written Constitution of the country. Sir, I think I shall never come, in this country, when higher law shall be used as a substitute for the written law. God forbid that such a day shall ever arrive! Millions will enjoy the blessings of free institutions with us.

Mr. Smith, of New York. Will the gentleman yield me the floor for a few minutes?

Mr. Wright. Does the gentleman desire to make a speech?

Mr. Smith. I rose not because I wish to reply to the gentleman's question, for I do not wish to reply to it. But, as he put the question to me, and might deem silence in the House as evidence of my inability to reply to it; and I trust that the gentleman will feel no better after my reply.

Mr. Wright. After having called the gentleman out, I cannot refuse him the floor.

Mr. Smith. The gentleman has referred me to that clause of the Constitution which respects fugitives from labour; and it is on that clause that my question is based. Now not to consume the time of the gentleman with any other reason for my denying that the slave is property in the Constitution of the United States, I will only advert to the fact, that three days previous to the close of the convention which framed the Constitution, the committee on style made their report; and in that report, in a strike out, they struck out the word "slave," and to supply its place with the word "service." This substitution was made by a *unanimous* vote, and for the very reason that "service" is applicable to a condition of slaves, and "service" the condition of freemen. I hold, therefore, that the word "service" in the Constitution refers to freemen, and to freemen only. To hold that the framers of the Constitution did after the substitution I have referred to, mean that the word service should refer to those held to service time them with hypocrisy. I add that the facts I have here given, may be found in the Madison papers.

Mr. Wright. That is not my construction of those papers. The very language of which the gentleman has read was made upon the suggestion of a Southern member of that body, who thought it would be better not to introduce the word "slave" into the Constitution, as there is no such word in any other known code of laws, and made a few commentaries upon what the gentleman from New York has asserted to himself it to order.

[The remarks of Mr. Wright, in reply to the speech related to other topics, and was of no special interest.]

Speech of Mr. Phillips, of Alabama.

Friday, Dec. 23.

The House being again in Committee of the Whole,

Mr. Phillips, of Alabama, said, the question before the committee was the reference of the President's message; and yet, from the latitude of debate, not only had the principles of the message been involved, but the question of Slavery, in connection with the Texas Annexation, the Ostend affair, and the constitutionality of the act of 1850, which invested in the Secretary of the Treasury the appointment of a slave-catching corps. And whatever else was to be involved in the discussion, or on what other unknown sea they were yet to be launched, no one could tell; not even that notorious person, the "oldest inhabitant."

He could not say that he was surprised by the sentiments which fell from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Smith], and from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Giddings], though he confessed the sentiments in themselves were startling and novel. But he was not surprised, because those stereotyped sentimentalities which issue from the lips of Abolitionists had fallen on ears open to receive and drink in with delight the least emotion of surprise. Invective, unmeasured and unsparing abuse, had been poured out by the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, and those members have maintained their seats in quiet, in decorum, and without reply. Nay, more, they had been called on to withdraw the remarks of those who, denying the obligation of their constitutional oath, could falsify history and the plain provisions of the Constitution to support and sustain them in the violation of their pledged faith.

This institution of Slavery had been inherited. It was sacred to him by the Federal compact. He would call on himself to defend it, and on every other inherited object of those gentlemen: that they might establish the place as the centre from which they may spread their fair arrows to every section of the Union to light up a flame of discord. When the Constitution shall fail to secure Southern rights, for which it was ordained, it was strong in the expression of its duties, and restraints, which the law imposes. But the sword of Captain Ingraham and the pen of Secretary Marcy are destined to joint immortality.

[From this point the debate turned upon other topics.]

SKETCH OF MR. PALFREY'S LECTURE.

The Second Lecture in the Course of the New York Anti-Slavery Society was delivered in the Broadway Tabernacle, December 20th.

Mr. Palfrey commenced by stating that unless he read the origins of the Constitution, he was in great danger in this country of losing altogether the benefits which had been secured to us in the past. When we spoke of the Constitution, as it was now interpreted, the iron military despotism was referred to, under which there was no protection to life, liberty or property. Such was the case, if the objectionable law of Captain Ingraham and the pen of Secretary Marcy are destined to joint immortality.

What Shall Say in reply to his observations? Do not let the gentleman suppose that I am putting the question now with the view of obtaining from him an immediate answ

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to Sydney Howard Gay, New York.
Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to Francis Jackson, Treasurer, at Boston; or to Sydney Howard Gay, New York.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1853.

IMPORTED REPUBLICANS.

It is well known to all who are (or ever have been) *gourmets*, or connoisseurs in wine that there are some certain vintages of so delicate a flavour, of so ethereal an aroma, that they cannot survive a sea-voyage. If not absolutely spoiled and good for nothing when they arrive on this side the Atlantic, at least they have lost "the divine perfection of their first being" and been converted into a very washy and insipid, if not deleterious, beverage. There are some political and moral virtues which seem to have as little "body," as the wine-merchants would call it, as these children of the Sun, and equally incapable of enduring the breath of the sea-breezes and the heavings of the Ocean billows. The love of Liberty used to be regarded as a virtue of a hardy growth. Milton called the object of that passion a "Mountain Nymph," one that had been nursed in the thin cold air of Alpine heights, and trained by a life among precipices and avalanches, "to suffer and be strong." But we have changed all that, as well as many other matters of opinion, in these "old days of the world," as Lord Bacon describeth modern times. Liberty herself is a very different goddess from what she was in the days of the inspired Roundhead. She was then always on foot and actively pressing forward to the things that were before. She is now sitting down, resting herself after her labours, and looking backward at the things that are behind, as any one may see that will examine her effigies on the medals struck in her honour by the Model Republic, the possession of which is the most earnest ambition of its inhabitants. She has taken off the Liberty Cap, which symbolized her own emancipation, and has put it on the point of her spear, to intimate that she is ready to run any contemporary slave through the heart who shall attempt to crown himself with it, without her permission. The object of the love having thus changed its character, it is not surprising that the passion itself should have been modified also.

At any rate, the love of Liberty is of so queasy a constitution in these oester-monger days that it will no longer bear transportation, any more than Chablis or the finer Burgundies. It is, almost invariably, found to be "pricked," to borrow a phrase again from the vintner, and good for little but to be cast out and be trampled under foot of men. This is, very likely, owing to the adulteration of the article and the way in which it has been drugged or "doctored" for the particular market to which it was to be exported. In its pure state, as we conceive, it is the desire of lawful liberty for ourselves and all the world beside. As generally offered to the public, now-a-days, it is the desire of being free ourselves, at the expense of any quantity of Slavery for other people. A Republicanism that will endure a sea-voyage, like the wine-pressed Austrian oppression, and which in Hungary included all mankind, could not be imported to America for a market, without being reduced by large infusions of native growth, which excludes one-sixth of the population from the idea. A Republicanism which had sprung up under the tramplings of the Saxon in Ireland, and which was loudly hragged of as a "neat" and genuine article, when brought into the port of New York must receive the brand of American Slavery, before it can be permitted to make glad the heart of the American People. We are very particular as to the quality of the foreign Republicanism we admit into our market. If the Bill of Health were but half as scrupulous as to deleterious articles of meat and drink which are offered to the lieges, the sanitary condition of the nation would be much higher. But we insist upon the imported article being identified with that we make at home, and which we protect by much more stringent Tariffs than any invented for the benefit of Cotton and Coal, or else we will have none of it.

We have been led to these reflections by the Report of the Banquet given, the other day, to John Mitchell, the Irish Patriot. We are not disposed to question the Irish Patriotism of that gentleman. Without entering into the consideration of the character of the Movement with which he was connected, and admitting that he had proved his sincerity by his sufferings there, we claim that we have a perfect right to examine his Democratic Idea, by the test which is furnished by our Democratic Idea. We need not go far for the touchstone. By whom was this Banquet spread? The man chosen to preside over it must be a fair sample of their quality. And who was he? The District Attorney of the United States, Charles O'Conor, one of the noisiest of the Castle Garden Union-Savers, one of the chiefest of the Hundred Slave-catchers—the man who looks upon the President that made him as an Abolitionist and a Traitor, because he would not shut the gates of mercy on every man who breathed an opinion against Slavery, however deep may have been his penitence, and however public his recantation. When such a man sits at the head of the board, we may easily imagine the character of those that surround it. This tool of our Republican tyranny, who holds his office only by virtue of his readiness to seize and send back to their despots the John Mitchells that may have sought refuge here, could speak of the "Union which bound together those of the Old World, who seek and strive for Liberty, and ourselves of the New World, who are blessed in the enjoyment of it!" And Mr. Mitchell, in his reply to the toast which welcomed him "to Freedom in America," most carefully remembered to forget that there was any such thing as Slavery here. What a wet blanket would not the faintest allusion to the fact that there were fugitives from tyranny, perhaps within the sound of his voice, certainly within the circuit of the city, whom the Chairman and almost every man at the feast were ready to return to it on demand, have been to the enthusiasm of the hour! But no such skeleton was uncovered by his hand at that Banquet.

So it was with the speech of Mr. Meagher. It was a carefully prepared and eloquent performance. Had there been nothing to convict him of inconsistency, it would have been an unanswerable, as well as a felicitous, effort at oratory. But, coming from a man who has been two or three years in the country, who has been through the Southern States, and discoursed of Liberty alongside of the auction-blocks of New Orleans, we must be permitted to regard it as no better than a Rhetorical Flourish. We have much compassion for men who have undergone personal hardships, imprisonment and exile for the sake of ideas, but our compassion cannot be mingled with respect as long as they toutly accept Ideas worse than the worst of those against which they rebelled, as the price of sympathy for themselves. We think these exiles from European despotisms have great cause of complaint, and of contempt, against those Americans who, while vociferous Democrats at home, are the most supple of tuft-hunters and of toad-eaters abroad. But we do not see much to choose between them and the foreign Democrats who humble themselves before the more despicable despotism of our Slaveocracy, in the vain and desperate hope of conciliating its assistance. We did not expect anything better of these gentlemen. Their aim was a limited one and regarded only their own deliverance and their own advantage. But their wrong to the oppressed everywhere, worked by their silence as much as it could be by their speech, is made none the less by this fact. What Mr. Mitchell complains that Secretary Marcy is doing for him, he is virtually doing to three and a half millions of oppressed men, as good before God as he.

We are rather surprised to find that these gentlemen do not seem to be profited by the experience of their predecessor, M. Kossuth, and really appear to expect that the American people will, sometime or other, do something for the oppressed Nationalities of Europe! Mr. Mitchell hopes that America may prove to be the fulcrum of the lever which is to move the Old World! Poor man! He will soon find that princes' favours are more to be relied upon than those of Slaveholding Democrats. He will find, as M. Kossuth did, that the governing influences of this country are as bitterly hostile to popular movements in Europe as Nicholas or Napoleon. They have the instinct which makes all tyrants kindred. The European patriots will as soon find aid and comfort from Pius or Francis Joseph as from our Slaveholding Oligarchy. Mr. Marcy was the organ by which that Power spoke. And though Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Meagher may speak and print, and eat and drink, destruction to the Saxon, they will never be permitted to utter anything that will compromise the peace of the country and endanger the staple of cotton. They will learn by experience, if they will not believe it on our assurance, that a Despotism is a Despotism still for all it calls itself a Republic. They may be made the occasion of airing uniforms and of imbibing turtle soup and champagne; but for any substantial aid, they may as well turn to the Pope or the Czar at once. We trust that they will learn, from what they have, before them, that the Cause of Liberty, like the Cause of Tyranny, is one and indivisible, the world over, and that it is of no use to look for help against a despot with a sceptre to one with a cat-o'-nine-tails in his hand. Such a hope is as vain as the complianees it induces are heart-sick and unworthy of consistent lovers of human freedom.—E. G.

AGITATION IN CONGRESS.

The political wiseacres, who flattered themselves that Anti-Slavery Agitation had been forever silenced by the Compromises of 1850 and the triumphant election of Franklin Pierce to the Presidency, must feel their self-complacency not a little disturbed on finding that the hated question is the very first to obtrude itself into the debates of the new Congress. It comes up, too, legitimately in connection with topics introduced to the attention of that body by the very President whose election, it was supposed, had put a final extinguisher upon the Anti-Slavery sentiment of the country. The slaveholders, having once humbled the North through the treachery of her own representatives, flatter themselves that there is now no limit to their power in any department of the Government; that they may safely demand of the President and of Congress any concurring thing that will enhance the perpetuity of their darling institution. Hence their heads were never so full of schemes for the aggrandizement of Slavery as at the present time. They have come up to the present Congress with such a multiplicity of axes to be sharpened upon the national grindstone, that the subservient North, which has so long and so patiently toiled at the crank for their accommodation, is in danger of becoming rebellious at last from sheer exhaustion! The Southern Democracy, following up the advantage she gained in the recent struggle, may yet provoke a contest that will prove to be a North of a very different temperature from that which has hitherto been laid down upon the political maps. The saying of the wise man, that "pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall," may perchance find its most significant illustration in events soon to transpire in the history of the Slave Power. However that may be, one thing is certain, viz.: that so long as the slaveholders compel the President to bring before Congress projects so infamous as that for paying Spanish pirates for the victims that have escaped from their toils, it will be impossible for them to stay the progress of Anti-Slavery agitation.

A large portion of our space this week is occupied with a debate which was opened by Gerrit Smith, and which, though for a time suspended, will, we apprehend, be soon re-opened. Mr. Smith's Speech, as reported in the *Globe*, was already in type, when a letter from him informed us that that report was incomplete and inaccurate, and he therefore issued a pamphlet edition revised and corrected by himself. We therefore cancelled the first report, with the intention of giving the revised speech to our readers, if possible, next week, but at any rate very soon. The speeches of Messrs. Preston (of Kentucky) and Dean (of New York) in reply to Mr. Smith, that of Mr. Giddings in reply to Mr. Dean, and upon the case of the Amistad, the brief remarks of Mike Walsh, the Tammany rate (abortive) effort of Mr. Wright (of Pa.), and the short address of Mr. Phillips (of Ala.), we copy as reported in the *Globe*.

Mr. Smith, in leading off upon the discussion of the President's Message, exhibited a courage for which we honour him. He disregarded the precedent by which, hitherto, new members have been constrained to observe silence until the 'old stagers' of the House have had their say. He also ventured to make use of his application to many of those who find their way to the Halls of Congress, but it is manifestly absurd when applied to such a man as Mr. Smith, whose knowledge of public affairs is equal to any emergency, and whose peculiar position requires not "a masterly inactivity," but great boldness, promptness and tact. Instead of following the example of Mr. Sumner, by forbearing to utter his sentiments until, by private intercourse with Southern members, he could acquire an influence over them and satisfy them that he is neither a fanatic nor a madman, he has chosen to march boldly up to the work which he felt himself called to perform, and to *command* their respect by his fidelity to the cause which he professes to serve. For this the friends of freedom owe him hearty thanks, and they will not fail to see in this example of his courage and good sense a happy augury of his future career.

The tone of Mr. Preston's reply indicates a change in the tactics of the South. The attempt to silence discussion by denunciation and threats is seen to be a failure, and hereafter we may hope that Southern members will at least endeavour to meet argument with argument instead of violence. Those who imagined that Mr. Smith would be in danger of assassination may now see how little ground there was for apprehending that such a tragedy would be enacted.

Mr. Giddings's Speech, like all his efforts, was timely, vigorous and bold. His exposure of the iniquitous efforts of the slaveholders to compel the North to pay the Spanish pirates, Ruiz and Montes, for the captives of the Amistad, entitles him to the thanks of the friends of freedom, and we hope it may have the effect to arouse them to a sense of the importance of sending to the Halls of Congress a host of such Abolitionists as he.

Theodore Parker has recently preached and will soon publish three discourses on "Crime." The subject is an important one, and his views will no doubt command attention.

REV. T. K. BEECHER'S LECTURE.

Hon. Joshua R. Giddings being prevented by sudden illness from fulfilling his appointment, the Third Lecture in the New York Anti-Slavery Society's Course was delivered, on Tuesday evening last, at the Tabernacle, by Rev. Thomas K. Beecher, who, on short notice, kindly consented to fill the very important vacancy. He took a survey of the Anti-Slavery controversy from what he regarded as the *Christian* standpoint. Admitting, to the full extent, the evils of Slavery as denounced by Abolitionists, he contended that, after all, the question was only one form of sin. Selfishness with which the whole family of man is cursed, and from which they can be delivered only through the operations of Christianity upon the heart. The Anti-Slavery cause must be carried forward less by the power of combativeness and more under the inspiration of love. Mr. Beecher uttered a great deal of wholesome truth—truth, too, which needed utterance; but we frankly confess that the lecture, as a whole, disappointed us. It seemed to us adapted (not designed) to produce an impression upon many minds that, after all, it is not worth while for anybody to be excited about Slavery *in particular*, since it is only one of a host of evils. He appeared to assume (though he did not say in so many words) that those who had conducted the Anti-Slavery Movement were taking a sectional view of a great question; that they did not understand the real nature of the evil against which they are struggling, and that they needed some one to teach them broader views. Now, we honour Mr. Beecher for speaking his own views manfully, but we assure him that his lecture presented no new lesson of comprehensiveness to those who are acquainted with the history and the literature of Anti-Slavery. Abolitionists have always distinctly seen that the work they are trying to do is part of a greater one;

Miscellaneous Department.

THE ENDING AND BEGINNING OF THE YEAR.

BY ALFRED TENNYSON.

Ring out, wild bells, to the wild sky,
The flying clouds, the frosty light;
The year is dying in the night;
Ring out, wild bells, and let him die.

Ring out the old, ring in the new,
Ring happily, bells, across the snow:
The Year is going, let him go;
Ring out the false, ring in the true.

Ring out the grief that saps the mind,
For those that here we see no more;
Ring out the feud of rich and poor,
Ring in redress to all mankind.

Ring out a slowly dying cause,
And ancient forms of party strife;
Ring in the nobler modes of life,
With sweeter manners, purer laws.

Ring out the want, the care, the sin,
The faithless coldness of the times;
Ring out, ring out, my mournful rhymes,
But ring the fuller universal in.

Ring out false pride in place and blood,
The civic slanders and the spite;
Ring in the love of truth and right,
Ring in the common love of good.

Ring out old shapes of foul disease,
Ring out the narrow lust of gold;
Ring out the thousand wars of old,
Ring in the thousand years of peace.

Ring in the valiant men and free,
The larger heart, the kindlier hand;
Ring out the darkness of the land,
Ring in the Christ that is to be.

SPEECH OF JOHN MITCHELL,
AT THE MITCHELL DINNER.

MR. CHAIRMAN, CITIZENS OF NEW YORK, CITIZENS OF AMERICA: It makes my pulse beat stronger to find myself in the presence of free citizens, to speak to an assembly of men who have a right to the high name of "citizen." Often, in my native country, I have stood before multitudes of beings, apparently human beings, having the gait and aspect of men, say, having many of the attributes of men, and of natural state—the feelings, the passions, the individual courage of men—but possessing none of the rights and dignity, none of the civic and political organization, the natural life and power, which ambition, that set men above the heads, and but little lower than the angels. Oh! I have stood in presence of myriade of my countrymen, and have not seen the face of one citizen, whether even of loyal subject; and, believe me, this is a hideous sight. True citizenship was out of our reach there —loyalty was impossible there; for law was not, by solemn award of the nation to the rest of life, an American citizen. This is more than rehabilitation —it is promotion. The monarchical Eact casts me out—the republican West welcomes and embraces me. One slave the less in Europe—One freeman more, America, to thee!" Many a time I landed on joyful happy shores I have anxiously sought to fathom, to gauge, to weigh, and to appreciate exactly the real meaning, the actual, social value of the public honours which have been heaped upon me or offered to me; and, with all the predisposition in the world to doubt and undervalue and disparage popular demonstrations in general, I cannot refuse to see in all this a significant, a portentous fact. I know well, indeed, what the English press will say, and will try to think of it. The Americans, they will say (for I know their slang by heart), love a little excitement and novelty. Mario and Grisi not having arrived as expected, the merry public of New York condescends to amuse itself in the meantime with the rantings of an Irish agitator, two. Then, there is the Irish vote, as it is called. Scheming politicians, they will say, want to make capital for the hard shells or for the soft, and so they force themselves to enact a little Irish enthusiasm, to amuse for one evening. But this explanation will not over so though comfortable to the British mind, it is not true—there is something deeper. For, in the first place, I am no orator, like Grattan, whose silver tones enchained through its ear, as the queens of song can do; neither can I be of the smallest service to hard chells or to soft. In political conchology I have no skill—the mystery of barnacles is unknown to me, and what a silver gray may mean, alas! I cannot tell. Let England think of it well—in no single article can I minister to the popular appetite for excitement. I cannot give the Pope to be Antichrist, as one Gavazzi, I am told, can do; neither am I able to demonstrate that the Protestants are the locusts who were to arise out of the bottomless pit, so Catholic thunder has often told me from St. The great Anglo-Saxon idea, also, has in me neither a preacher nor a pupil. Though an Anglo-Saxon by blood and race, I confess that I feel no pride from the circumstance; I abhor a bully; I would hang a robber. I spit upon "manifest destiny." I despise that Anglo-Saxon courage and energy which is still for war, war without end, and cries peace, peace, when it meets its match; and on the whole I could find quite as much to say for the great Panslavic ides of Eastern Europe as for this Anglo-Saxon humbug which England, of late years, has been trying to cram down me with. I would have the British public, also, to take note of the fact that ever since I landed in San Francisco I have spoken uniformly of the British government with bitter and vindictive hostility. I would not receive the hospitalities of America under a false pretence. I would keep back nothing of what was in my heart—and I knew that America was a great commercial country, New York a great city—that Wall street and Lombard street are cousine and dear friends—that England is here regarded as a rich customer, Ireland as a mendicant pauper and useful drudge. Yet here, to night we are within sight of that Wall street, in the centre of the great Emporium of the West, and here I, an avowed enemy of English power, am greeted with heart and voice by the proud citizens of this grand city, and whitest hands have waived their gracious welcome to the banished outlaw. Here is a phenomenon which will assuredly puzzle John Bull, as he calls himself. How then (John will say, and will say) make dollars out of him? For you know it is an article of faith in England that Americans worship nothing, believe in nothing, but the eternal dollar. Now, I will suggest to John a solution of the problem, which he can consider at leisure. The explanation, perhaps, is, that Americans, much as they love excitement and novelty, much as they relish a spicy religious controversy, or an impassioned political harangue—much as they love dollars and clipper ships—love freedom and justice more. For I hope it is that a rich and prosperous neighbour is liked well enough here as a customer—but a baffled, beggared, outlawed votary of freedom is loved as a brother. Perhaps it is that the eloquent sermon preached by whizzing bullets from Bunker's Hill over the burning roofs of Charlestown, sunk deep into the national heart, and begins to fructify for all nations. Ah! perhaps it is that the brawny child, Young Democracy, born that day to the music of crashing roof-trees and whizzing rifles, and baptized abundantly in blood, has grown to be a man, and begins to feel that he may one day be called upon to carry the saving doctrine of that sublime christening sermon to all the ends of the earth. It is well, then, that I am no orator, and no politician, and no polemical gladiator; it is well that I have no other claim on you than simply as an advocate of liberty. Thus your pronouncement to-night for democratic freedom, your recognition of the cause of Ireland as a legitimate branch of that sacred cause, is the more emphatic, the more unmistakable, the more pure and simple, the more encouraging to crushed and struggling liberty all the world over. But I know also that the monarchical press of Europe will further accuse Americans of a breach of international comity in this matter—of the politeness that should reign in the intercouse between well-bred powers. Already Austria feels disgusted at the rudeness of an American commander in carrying off the poor Hungarian Kossta, out of the talons of her two headed vulture. Great Britain must assuredly feel hurt that her political enemies, whom she has fried to brand as felons, should be comforted and abetted in their felony by America. Oh! Columbia, republicanism, where are your manners? Is this your comity? Do you think nothing of putting an affront upon a constitutional, a liberal government, from which your own government has received assurances of friendly relations? International comity is a great matter; even some American statesmen cultivate that branch of good manners. I perceive that the Secretary of State at Washington, in his last note to the Austrian Minister, actuated certainly by the nicest sense of diplomatic courtesy, has taken care to warn all adventurers and seditious propagandists that the United States will in nowise sanction or protect them if they engage in fraudulent machinations for disturbing the internal quiet of other nations; and he further declares "that the United States will not allow to any of the large group powere to promote tranquillity." In all this there seems to me, I confess, more of comity towards the coopted conspirators of Europe, and less of generosity towards their exiled victims, than I should have thought befitting in the manifesto of an American minister. Now, I have a word to say on this subject of international comity. The phrase contains a falsehood. Nations have nothing to do with the nation whose flag waved over him—but politeness to the Kaiser of Austria; it was a delicate attention to the Czar of all the Russias. The Czar himself, also, is the very pink and flower of this sort of courtesy; and it is reported in the Irish that the ladies of the Polish convent on the bare back; but if you only saw him at a review in Vienna, with his friend, the other Emperor, or in London, with his friend, the Queen, you would do you good to witness the peace and love that reign amongst those crowned brethren and sisters. Great Britain, however, is certainly the most accomplished master in this wonder of politeness. To remember that, after the late Italian struggle, certain weather-worn refugees, with a price upon their heads, made their way to Malta and asked permission to land; but the British governor, keenly waved back the point of guns of the fortress showed their grinning muzzles. The poor souls wanted only shelter and permission to take lodgings and buy victuals—it is all very well, said the Governor, but cannot stop here a day, and so they passed on to Barbary or Morocco, or—Heaven knows where. Strange to say, the repulsed refugees saw no politeness in this reception. Yet it was true international comity; and, after all, I do suppose the guns of the fortress showed their grinning muzzles. The poor souls wanted only shelter and permission to take lodgings and buy victuals—it is all very well, said the Governor, but cannot stop here a day, and so they passed on to Barbary or Morocco, or—Heaven knows where. Strange to say, the repulsed refugees saw no politeness in this reception. Yet it was true international comity; and, after all, I do suppose the natural state—the feelings, the passions, the individual courage of men—but possessing none of the rights and dignity, none of the civic and political organization, the natural life and power, which ambition, that set men above the heads, and but little lower than the angels. Oh! I have stood in presence of myriade of my countrymen, and have not seen the face of one citizen, whether even of loyal subject; and, believe me, this is a hideous sight. True citizenship was out of our reach there —loyalty was impossible there; for law was not, by solemn award of the nation to the rest of life, an American citizen. This is more than rehabilitation —it is promotion. The monarchical Eact casts me out—the republican West welcomes and embraces me. One slave the less in Europe—One freeman more, America, to thee!" Many a time I landed on joyful happy shores I have anxiously sought to fathom, to gauge, to weigh, and to appreciate exactly the real meaning, the actual, social value of the public honours which have been heaped upon me or offered to me; and, with all the predisposition in the world to doubt and undervalue and disparage popular demonstrations in general, I cannot refuse to see in all this a significant, a portentous fact. I know well, indeed, what the English press will say, and will try to think of it. The Americans, they will say (for I know their slang by heart), love a little excitement and novelty. Mario and Grisi not having arrived as expected, the merry public of New York condescends to amuse itself in the meantime with the rantings of an Irish agitator, two. Then, there is the Irish vote, as it is called. Scheming politicians, they will say, want to make capital for the hard shells or for the soft, and so they force themselves to enact a little Irish enthusiasm, to amuse for one evening. But this explanation will not over so though comfortable to the British mind, it is not true—there is something deeper. For, in the first place, I am no orator, like Grattan, whose silver tones enchained through its ear, as the queens of song can do; neither can I be of the smallest service to hard chells or to soft. In political conchology I have to skill—the mystery of barnacles is unknown to me, and what a silver gray may mean, alas! I cannot tell. Let England think of it well—in no single article can I minister to the popular appetite for excitement. I cannot give the Pope to be Antichrist, as one Gavazzi, I am told, can do; neither am I able to demonstrate that the Protestants are the locusts who were to arise out of the bottomless pit, so Catholic thunder has often told me from St. The great Anglo-Saxon idea, also, has in me neither a preacher nor a pupil. Though an Anglo-Saxon by blood and race, I confess that I feel no pride from the circumstance; I abhor a bully; I would hang a robber. I spit upon "manifest destiny." I despise that Anglo-Saxon courage and energy which is still for war, war without end, and cries peace, peace, when it meets its match; and on the whole I could find quite as much to say for the great Panslavic ides of Eastern Europe as for this Anglo-Saxon humbug which England, of late years, has been trying to cram down me with. I would have the British public, also, to take note of the fact that ever since I landed in San Francisco I have spoken uniformly of the British government with bitter and vindictive hostility. I would not receive the hospitalities of America under a false pretence. I would keep back nothing of what was in my heart—and I knew that America was a great commercial country, New York a great city—that Wall street and Lombard street are cousine and dear friends—that England is here regarded as a rich customer, Ireland as a mendicant pauper and useful drudge. Yet here, to night we are within sight of that Wall street, in the centre of the great Emporium of the West, and here I, an avowed enemy of English power, am greeted with heart and voice by the proud citizens of this grand city, and whitest hands have waived their gracious welcome to the banished outlaw. Here is a phenomenon which will assuredly puzzle John Bull, as he calls himself. How then (John will say, and will say) make dollars out of him? For you know it is an article of faith in England that Americans worship nothing, believe in nothing, but the eternal dollar. Now, I will suggest to John a solution of the problem, which he can consider at leisure. The explanation, perhaps, is, that Americans, much as they love excitement and novelty, much as they relish a spicy religious controversy, or an impassioned political harangue—much as they love dollars and clipper ships—love freedom and justice more. For I hope it is that a rich and prosperous neighbour is liked well enough here as a customer—but a baffled, beggared, outlawed votary of freedom is loved as a brother. Perhaps it is that the eloquent sermon preached by whizzing bullets from Bunker's Hill over the burning roofs of Charlestown, sunk deep into the national heart, and begins to fructify for all nations. Ah! perhaps it is that the brawny child, Young Democracy, born that day to the music of crashing roof-trees and whizzing rifles, and baptized abundantly in blood, has grown to be a man, and begins to feel that he may one day be called upon to carry the saving doctrine of that sublime christening sermon to all the ends of the earth. It is well, then, that I am no orator, and no politician, and no polemical gladiator; it is well that I have no other claim on you than simply as an advocate of liberty. Thus your pronouncement to-night for democratic freedom, your recognition of the cause of Ireland as a legitimate branch of that sacred cause, is the more emphatic, the more unmistakable, the more pure and simple, the more encouraging to crushed and struggling liberty all the world over. But I know also that the monarchical press of Europe will further accuse Americans of a breach of international comity in this matter—of the politeness that should reign in the intercouse between well-bred powers. Already Austria feels disgusted at the rudeness of an American commander in carrying off the poor Hungarian Kossta, out of the talons of her two headed vulture. Great Britain must assuredly feel hurt that her political enemies, whom she has fried to brand as felons, should be comforted and abetted in their felony by America. Oh! republicanism, where are your manners? Is this your comity? Do you think nothing of putting an affront upon a constitutional, a liberal government, from which your own government has received assurances of friendly relations? International comity is a great matter; even some American statesmen cultivate that branch of good manners. I perceive that the Secretary of State at Washington, in his last note to the Austrian Minister, actuated certainly by the nicest sense of diplomatic courtesy, has taken care to warn all adventurers and seditious propagandists that the United States will in nowise sanction or protect them if they engage in fraudulent machinations for disturbing the internal quiet of other nations; and he further declares "that the United States will not allow to any of the large group powere to promote tranquillity." In all this there seems to me, I confess, more of comity towards the coopted conspirators of Europe, and less of generosity towards their exiled victims, than I should have thought befitting in the manifesto of an American minister. Now, I have a word to say on this subject of international comity. The phrase contains a falsehood. Nations have nothing to do with the nation whose flag waved over him—but politeness to the Kaiser of Austria; it was a delicate attention to the Czar of all the Russias. The Czar himself, also, is the very pink and flower of this sort of courtesy; and it is reported in the Irish that the ladies of the Polish convent on the bare back; but if you only saw him at a review in Vienna, with his friend, the other Emperor, or in London, with his friend, the Queen, you would do you good to witness the peace and love that reign amongst those crowned brethren and sisters. Great Britain, however, is certainly the most accomplished master in this wonder of politeness. To remember that, after the late Italian struggle, certain weather-worn refugees, with a price upon their heads, made their way to Malta and asked permission to land; but the British governor keenly waved back the point of guns of the fortress showed their grinning muzzles. The poor souls wanted only shelter and permission to take lodgings and buy victuals—it is all very well, said the Governor, but cannot stop here a day, and so they passed on to Barbary or Morocco, or—Heaven knows where. Strange to say, the repulsed refugees saw no politeness in this reception. Yet it was true international comity; and, after all, I do suppose the natural state—the feelings, the passions, the individual courage of men—but possessing none of the rights and dignity, none of the civic and political organization, the natural life and power, which ambition, that set men above the heads, and but little lower than the angels. Oh! I have stood in presence of myriade of my countrymen, and have not seen the face of one citizen, whether even of loyal subject; and, believe me, this is a hideous sight. True citizenship was out of our reach there —loyalty was impossible there; for law was not, by solemn award of the nation to the rest of life, an American citizen. This is more than rehabilitation —it is promotion. The monarchical Eact casts me out—the republican West welcomes and embraces me. One slave the less in Europe—One freeman more, America, to thee!" Many a time I landed on joyful happy shores I have anxiously sought to fathom, to gauge, to weigh, and to appreciate exactly the real meaning, the actual, social value of the public honours which have been heaped upon me or offered to me; and, with all the predisposition in the world to doubt and undervalue and disparage popular demonstrations in general, I cannot refuse to see in all this a significant, a portentous fact. I know well, indeed, what the English press will say, and will try to think of it. The Americans, they will say (for I know their slang by heart), love a little excitement and novelty. Mario and Grisi not having arrived as expected, the merry public of New York condescends to amuse itself in the meantime with the rantings of an Irish agitator, two. Then, there is the Irish vote, as it is called. Scheming politicians, they will say, want to make capital for the hard shells or for the soft, and so they force themselves to enact a little Irish enthusiasm, to amuse for one evening. But this explanation will not over so though comfortable to the British mind, it is not true—there is something deeper. For, in the first place, I am no orator, like Grattan, whose silver tones enchained through its ear, as the queens of song can do; neither can I be of the smallest service to hard chells or to soft. In political conchology I have to skill—the mystery of barnacles is unknown to me, and what a silver gray may mean, alas! I cannot tell. Let England think of it well—in no single article can I minister to the popular appetite for excitement. I cannot give the Pope to be Antichrist, as one Gavazzi, I am told, can do; neither am I able to demonstrate that the Protestants are the locusts who were to arise out of the bottomless pit, so Catholic thunder has often told me from St. The great Anglo-Saxon idea, also, has in me neither a preacher nor a pupil. Though an Anglo-Saxon by blood and race, I confess that I feel no pride from the circumstance; I abhor a bully; I would hang a robber. I spit upon "manifest destiny." I despise that Anglo-Saxon courage and energy which is still for war, war without end, and cries peace, peace, when it meets its match; and on the whole I could find quite as much to say for the great Panslavic ides of Eastern Europe as for this Anglo-Saxon humbug which England, of late years, has been trying to cram down me with. I would have the British public, also, to take note of the fact that ever since I landed in San Francisco I have spoken uniformly of the British government with bitter and vindictive hostility. I would not receive the hospitalities of America under a false pretence. I would keep back nothing of what was in my heart—and I knew that America was a great commercial country, New York a great city—that Wall street and Lombard street are cousine and dear friends—that England is here regarded as a rich customer, Ireland as a mendicant pauper and useful drudge. Yet here, to night we are within sight of that Wall street, in the centre of the great Emporium of the West, and here I, an avowed enemy of English power, am greeted with heart and voice by the proud citizens of this grand city, and whitest hands have waived their gracious welcome to the banished outlaw. Here is a phenomenon which will assuredly puzzle John Bull, as he calls himself. How then (John will say, and will say) make dollars out of him? For you know it is an article of faith in England that Americans worship nothing, believe in nothing, but the eternal dollar. Now, I will suggest to John a solution of the problem, which he can consider at leisure. The explanation, perhaps, is, that Americans, much as they love excitement and novelty, much as they relish a spicy religious controversy, or an impassioned political harangue—much as they love dollars and clipper ships—love freedom and justice more. For I hope it is that a rich and prosperous neighbour is liked well enough here as a customer—but a baffled, beggared, outlawed votary of freedom is loved as a brother. Perhaps it is that the eloquent sermon preached by whizzing bullets from Bunker's Hill over the burning roofs of Charlestown, sunk deep into the national heart, and begins to fructify for all nations. Ah! perhaps it is that the brawny child, Young Democracy, born that day to the music of crashing roof-trees and whizzing rifles, and baptized abundantly in blood, has grown to be a man, and begins to feel that he may one day be called upon to carry the saving doctrine of that sublime christening sermon to all the ends of the earth. It is well, then, that I am no orator, and no politician, and no polemical gladiator; it is well that I have no other claim on you than simply as an advocate of liberty. Thus your pronouncement to-night for democratic freedom, your recognition of the cause of Ireland as a legitimate branch of that sacred cause, is the more emphatic, the more unmistakable, the more pure and simple, the more encouraging to crushed and struggling liberty all the world over. But I know also that the monarchical press of Europe will further accuse Americans of a breach of international comity in this matter—of the politeness that should reign in the intercouse between well-bred powers. Already Austria feels disgusted at the rudeness of an American commander in carrying off the poor Hungarian Kossta, out of the talons of her two headed vulture. Great Britain must assuredly feel hurt that her political enemies, whom she has fried to brand as felons, should be comforted and abetted in their felony by America. Oh! republicanism, where are your manners? Is this your comity? Do you think nothing of putting an affront upon a constitutional, a liberal government, from which your own government has received assurances of friendly relations? International comity is a great matter; even some American statesmen cultivate that branch of good manners. I perceive that the Secretary of State at Washington, in his last note to the Austrian Minister, actuated certainly by the nicest sense of diplomatic courtesy, has taken care to warn all adventurers and seditious propagandists that the United States will in nowise sanction or protect them if they engage in fraudulent machinations for disturbing the internal quiet of other nations; and he further declares "that the United States will not allow to any of the large group powere to promote tranquillity." In all this there seems to me, I confess, more of comity towards the coopted conspirators of Europe, and less of generosity towards their exiled victims, than I should have thought befitting in the manifesto of an American minister. Now, I have a word to say on this subject of international comity. The phrase contains a falsehood. Nations have nothing to do with the nation whose flag waved over him—but politeness to the Kaiser of Austria; it was a delicate attention to the Czar of all the Russias. The Czar himself, also, is the very pink and flower of this sort of courtesy; and it is reported in the Irish that the ladies of the Polish convent on the bare back; but if you only saw him at a review in Vienna, with his friend, the other Emperor, or in London, with his friend, the Queen, you would do you good to witness the peace and love that reign amongst those crowned brethren and sisters. Great Britain, however, is certainly the most accomplished master in this wonder of politeness. To remember that, after the late Italian struggle, certain weather-worn refugees, with a price upon their heads, made their way to Malta and asked permission to land; but the British governor keenly waved back the point of guns of the fortress showed their grinning muzzles. The poor souls wanted only shelter and permission to take lodgings and buy victuals—it is all very well, said the Governor, but cannot stop here a day, and so they passed on to Barbary or Morocco, or—Heaven knows where. Strange to say, the repulsed refugees saw no politeness in this reception. Yet it was true international comity; and, after all, I do suppose the natural state—the feelings, the passions, the individual courage of men—but possessing none of the rights and dignity, none of the civic and political organization, the natural life and power, which ambition, that set men above the heads, and but little lower than the angels. Oh! I have stood in presence of myriade of my countrymen, and have not seen the face of one citizen, whether even of loyal subject; and, believe me, this is a hideous sight. True citizenship was out of our reach there —loyalty was impossible there; for law was not, by solemn award of the nation to the rest of life, an American citizen. This is more than rehabilitation —it is promotion. The monarchical Eact casts me out—the republican West welcomes and embraces me. One slave the less in Europe—One freeman more, America, to thee!" Many a time I landed on joyful happy shores I have anxiously sought to fathom, to gauge, to weigh, and to appreciate exactly the real meaning, the actual, social value of the public honours which have been heaped upon me or offered to me; and, with all the predisposition in the world to doubt and undervalue and disparage popular demonstrations in general, I cannot refuse to see in all this a significant, a portentous fact. I know well, indeed, what the English press will say, and will try to think of it. The Americans, they will say (for I know their slang by heart), love a little excitement and novelty. Mario and Grisi not having arrived as expected, the merry public of New York condescends to amuse itself in the meantime with the rantings of an Irish agitator, two. Then, there is the Irish vote, as it is called. Scheming politicians, they will say, want to make capital for the hard shells or for the soft, and so they force themselves to enact a little Irish enthusiasm, to amuse for one evening. But this explanation will not over so though comfortable to the British mind, it is not true—there is something deeper. For, in the first place, I am no orator, like Grattan, whose silver tones enchained through its ear, as the queens of song can do; neither can I be of the smallest service to hard chells or to soft. In political conchology I have to skill—the mystery of barnacles is unknown to me, and what a silver gray may mean, alas! I cannot tell. Let England think of it well—in no single article can I minister to the popular appetite for excitement. I cannot give the Pope to be Antichrist, as one Gavazzi, I am told, can do; neither am I able to demonstrate that the Protestants are the locusts who were to arise out of the bottomless pit, so Catholic thunder has often told me from St. The great Anglo-Saxon idea, also, has in me neither a preacher nor a pupil. Though an Anglo-Saxon by blood and race, I confess that I feel no pride from the circumstance; I abhor a bully; I would hang a robber. I spit upon "manifest destiny." I despise that Anglo-Saxon courage and energy which is still for war, war without end, and cries peace, peace, when it meets its match; and on the whole I could find quite as much to say for the great Panslavic ides of Eastern Europe as for this Anglo-Saxon humbug which England, of late years, has been trying to cram down me with. I would have the British public, also, to take note of the fact that ever since I landed in San Francisco I have spoken uniformly of the British government with bitter and vindictive hostility. I would not receive the hospitalities of America under a false pretence. I would keep back nothing of what was in my heart—and I knew that America was a great commercial country, New York a great city—that Wall street and Lombard street are cousine and dear friends—that England is here regarded as a rich customer, Ireland as a mendicant pauper and useful drudge. Yet here, to night we are within sight of that Wall street, in the centre of the great Emporium of the West, and here I, an avowed enemy of English power, am greeted with heart and voice by the proud citizens of this grand city, and whitest hands have waived their gracious welcome to the banished outlaw. Here is a phenomenon which will assuredly puzzle John Bull, as he calls himself. How then (John will say, and will say) make dollars out of him? For you know it is an article of faith in England that Americans worship nothing, believe in nothing, but the eternal dollar. Now, I will suggest to John a solution of the problem, which he can consider at leisure. The explanation, perhaps, is, that Americans, much as they love excitement and novelty, much as they relish a spicy religious controversy, or an impassioned political harangue—much as they love dollars and clipper ships—love freedom and justice more. For I hope it is that a rich and prosperous neighbour is liked well enough here as a customer—but a baffled, beggared, outlawed votary of freedom is loved as a brother. Perhaps it is that the eloquent sermon preached by whizzing bullets from Bunker's Hill over the burning roofs of Charlestown, sunk deep into the national heart, and begins to fructify for all nations. Ah! perhaps it is that the brawny child, Young Democracy, born that day to the music of crashing roof-trees and whizzing rifles, and baptized abundantly in blood, has grown to be a man, and begins to feel that he may one day be called upon to carry the saving doctrine of that sublime christening sermon to all the ends of the earth. It is well, then, that I am no orator, and no politician, and no polemical gladiator; it is well that I have no other claim on you than simply as an advocate of liberty. Thus your pronouncement to-night for democratic freedom, your recognition of the cause of Ireland as a legitimate branch of that sacred cause, is the more emphatic, the more unmistakable, the more pure and simple, the more encouraging to crushed and struggling liberty all the world over. But I know also that the monarchical press of Europe will further accuse Americans of a breach of international comity in this matter—of the politeness that should reign in the intercouse between well-bred powers. Already Austria feels disgusted at the rudeness of an American commander in carrying off the poor Hungarian Kossta, out of the talons of her two-headed vulture. Great Britain must assuredly feel hurt that her political enemies, whom she has fried to brand as felons, should be comforted and abetted in their felony by America. Oh! republicanism, where are your manners? Is this your comity? Do you think nothing of putting an affront upon a constitutional, a liberal government, from which your own government has received assurances of friendly relations? International comity is a great matter; even some American statesmen cultivate that branch of good manners. I perceive that the Secretary of State at Washington, in his last note to the Austrian Minister, actuated certainly by the nicest sense of diplomatic courtesy, has taken care to warn all adventurers and seditious propagandists that the United States will in nowise sanction or protect them if they engage in fraudulent machinations for disturbing the internal quiet of other nations; and he further declares "that the United States will not allow to any of the large group powere to promote tranquillity." In all this there seems to me, I confess, more of comity towards the coopted conspirators of Europe, and less of generosity towards their exiled victims, than I should have thought befitting in the manifesto of an American minister. Now, I have a word to say on this subject of international comity. The phrase contains a falsehood. Nations have nothing to do with the nation whose flag waved over him—but politeness to the Kaiser of Austria; it was a delicate attention to the Czar of all the Russias. The Czar himself, also, is the very pink and flower of this sort of courtesy; and it is reported in the Irish that the ladies of the Polish convent on the bare back; but if you only saw him at a review in Vienna, with his friend, the other Emperor, or in London, with his friend, the Queen, you would do you good to witness the peace and love that reign amongst those crowned brethren and sisters. Great Britain, however, is certainly the most accomplished master in this wonder of politeness. To remember that, after the late Italian struggle, certain weather-worn refugees, with a price upon their heads, made their way to Malta and asked permission to land; but the British governor keenly waved back the point of guns of the fortress showed their grinning muzzles. The poor souls wanted only shelter and permission to take lodgings and buy victuals—it is all very well, said the Governor, but cannot stop here a day, and so they passed on to Barbary or Morocco, or—Heaven knows where. Strange to say, the repulsed refugees saw no politeness in this reception. Yet it was true international comity; and, after all, I do suppose the natural state—the feelings, the passions, the individual courage of men—but possessing none of the rights and dignity, none of the civic and political organization, the natural life and power, which ambition, that set men above the heads, and but little lower than the angels. Oh! I have stood in presence of myriade of my countrymen, and have not seen the face of one citizen, whether even of loyal subject; and, believe me, this is a hideous sight. True citizenship was out of our reach there —loyalty was impossible there; for law was not, by solemn award of the nation to the rest of life, an American citizen. This is more than rehabilitation —it is promotion. The monarchical Eact casts me out—the republican West welcomes and embraces me. One slave the less in Europe—One freeman more, America, to thee!" Many a time I landed on joyful happy shores I have anxiously sought to fathom, to gauge, to weigh, and to appreciate exactly the real meaning, the actual, social value of the public honours which have been heaped upon me or offered to me; and, with all the predisposition in the world to doubt and undervalue and disparage popular demonstrations in general, I cannot refuse to see in all this a significant, a portentous fact. I know well, indeed, what the English press will say, and will try to think of it. The Americans, they will say (for I know their slang by heart), love a little excitement and novelty. Mario and Grisi not having arrived as expected, the merry public of New York condescends to amuse itself in the meantime with the rantings of an Irish agitator, two. Then, there is the Irish vote, as it is called. Scheming politicians, they will say, want to make capital for the hard shells or for the soft, and so they force themselves to enact a little Irish enthusiasm, to amuse for one evening. But this explanation will not over so though comfortable to the British mind, it is not true—there is something deeper. For, in the first place, I am no orator, like Grattan, whose silver tones enchained through its ear, as the queens of song can do; neither can I be of the smallest service to hard chells or to soft. In political conchology I have to skill—the mystery of barnacles is unknown to me, and what a silver gray may mean, alas! I cannot tell. Let England think of it well—in no single article can I minister to the popular appetite for excitement. I cannot give the Pope to be Antichrist, as one Gavazzi, I am told, can do; neither am I able to demonstrate that the Protestants are the locusts who were to arise out of the bottomless pit, so Catholic thunder has often told me from St. The great Anglo-Saxon idea, also, has in me neither a preacher nor a pupil. Though an Anglo-Saxon by blood and race, I confess that I feel no pride from the circumstance; I abhor a bully; I would hang a robber. I spit upon "manifest destiny." I despise that Anglo-Saxon courage and energy which is still for war, war without end, and cries peace, peace, when it meets its match; and on the whole I could find quite as much to say for the great Panslavic ides of Eastern Europe as for this Anglo-Saxon humbug which England, of late years, has been trying to cram down me with. I would have the British public, also, to take note of the fact that ever since I landed in San Francisco I have spoken uniformly of the British government with bitter and vindictive hostility. I would not receive the hospitalities of America under a false pretence. I would keep back nothing of what was in my heart—and I knew that America was a great commercial country, New York a great city—that Wall street and Lombard street are cousine and dear friends—that England is here regarded as a rich customer, Ireland as a mendicant pauper and useful drudge. Yet here, to night we are within sight of that Wall street, in the centre of the great Emporium of the West, and here I, an avowed enemy of English power, am greeted with heart and voice by the proud citizens of this grand city, and whitest hands have waived their gracious welcome to the banished outlaw. Here is a phenomenon which will assuredly puzzle John Bull, as he calls himself. How then (John will say, and will say) make dollars out of him? For you know it is an article of faith in England that Americans worship nothing, believe in nothing, but the eternal dollar. Now, I will suggest to John a solution of the problem, which he can consider at leisure. The explanation, perhaps, is, that Americans, much as they love excitement and novelty, much as they relish a spicy religious controversy, or an impassioned political harangue—much as they love dollars and clipper ships—love freedom and justice more. For I hope it is that a rich and prosperous neighbour is liked well enough here as a customer—but a baffled, beggared, outlawed votary of freedom is loved as a brother. Perhaps it is that the eloquent sermon preached by whizzing bullets from Bunker's Hill over the burning roofs of Charlestown, sunk deep into the national heart, and begins to fructify for all nations. Ah! perhaps it is that the brawny child, Young Democracy, born that day to the music of crashing roof-trees and whizzing rifles, and baptized abundantly in blood, has grown to be a man, and begins to feel that he may one day be called upon to carry the saving doctrine of that sublime christening sermon to all the ends of the earth. It is well, then, that I am no orator, and no politician, and no polemical gladiator; it is well that I have no other claim on you than simply as an advocate of liberty. Thus your pronouncement to-night for democratic freedom, your recognition of the cause of Ireland as a legitimate branch of that sacred cause, is the more emphatic, the more unmistakable, the more pure and simple, the more encouraging to crushed and struggling liberty all the world over. But I know also that the monarchical press of Europe will further accuse Americans of a breach of international comity in this matter—of the politeness that should reign in the intercouse between well-bred powers. Already Austria feels disgusted at the rudeness of an American commander in carrying off the poor Hungarian Kossta, out of the talons of her two-headed vulture. Great Britain must assuredly feel hurt that her political enemies, whom she has fried to brand as felons, should be comforted and abetted in their felony by America. Oh! republicanism, where are your manners? Is this your comity? Do you think nothing of putting an affront upon a constitutional, a liberal government, from which your own government has received assurances of friendly relations? International comity is a great matter; even some American statesmen cultivate that branch of good manners. I perceive that the Secretary of State at Washington, in his last note to the Austrian Minister, actuated certainly by the nicest sense of diplomatic courtesy, has taken care to warn all adventurers and seditious propagandists that the United States will in nowise sanction or protect them if they engage in fraudulent machinations for disturbing the internal quiet of other nations; and he further declares "that the United States will not allow to any of the large group powere to promote tranquillity." In all this there seems to me, I confess, more of comity towards the coopted conspirators of Europe, and less of generosity towards their exiled victims, than I should have thought befitting in the manifesto of an American minister. Now, I have a word to say on this subject of international comity. The phrase contains a falsehood. Nations have nothing to do with the nation whose flag waved over him—but politeness to the Kaiser of Austria; it was a delicate attention to the Czar of all the Russias. The Czar himself, also, is the very pink and flower of this sort of courtesy; and it is reported in the Irish that the ladies of the Polish convent on the bare back; but if you only saw him at a review in Vienna, with his friend, the other Emperor, or in London, with his friend, the Queen, you would do you good to witness the peace and love that reign amongst those crowned brethren and sisters. Great Britain, however, is certainly the most accomplished master in this wonder of politeness. To remember that, after the late Italian struggle, certain weather-worn refugees, with a price upon their heads, made their way to Malta and asked permission to land; but the British governor keenly waved back the point of guns of the fortress showed their grinning muzzles. The poor souls wanted only shelter and permission to take lodgings and buy victuals—it is all very well, said the Governor, but cannot stop here a day, and so they passed on to Barbary or Morocco, or—Heaven knows where. Strange to say, the repulsed refugees saw no politeness in this reception. Yet it was true international comity; and, after all, I do suppose the natural state—the feelings, the passions, the individual courage of men—but possessing none of the rights and dignity, none of the civic and political organization, the natural life and power, which ambition, that set men above the heads, and but little lower than the angels. Oh! I have stood in presence of myriade of my countrymen, and have not seen the face of one citizen, whether even of loyal subject; and, believe me, this is a hideous sight. True citizenship was out of our reach there —loyalty was impossible there; for law was not, by solemn award of the nation to the rest of life, an American citizen. This is more than rehabilitation —it is promotion. The monarchical Eact casts me out—the republican West welcomes and embraces me. One slave the less in Europe—One freeman more, America, to thee!" Many a time I landed on joyful happy shores I have anxiously sought to fathom, to gauge, to weigh, and to appreciate exactly the real meaning, the actual, social value of the public honours which have been heaped upon me or offered to me; and, with all the predisposition in the world to doubt and undervalue and disparage popular demonstrations in general, I cannot refuse to see in all this a significant, a portentous fact. I know well, indeed, what the English press will say, and will try to think of it. The Americans, they will say (for I know their slang by heart), love a little excitement and novelty. Mario and Grisi not having arrived as expected, the merry public of New York condescends to amuse itself in the meantime with the rantings of an Irish agitator, two. Then, there is the Irish vote, as it is called. Scheming politicians, they will say, want to make capital for the hard shells or for the soft, and so they force themselves to enact a little Irish enthusiasm, to amuse for one evening. But this explanation will not over so though comfortable to the British mind, it is not true—there is something deeper. For, in the first place, I am no orator, like Grattan, whose silver tones enchained through its ear, as the queens of song can do; neither can I be of the smallest service to hard chells or to soft. In political conchology I have to skill—the mystery of barnacles is unknown to me, and what a silver gray may mean, alas! I cannot tell. Let England think of it well—in no single article can I minister to the popular appetite for excitement. I cannot give the Pope to be Antichrist, as one Gavazzi, I am told, can do; neither am I able to demonstrate that the Protestants are the locusts who were to arise out of the bottomless pit, so Catholic thunder has often told me from St. The great Anglo-Saxon idea, also, has in me neither a preacher nor a pupil. Though an Anglo-Saxon by blood and race, I confess that I feel no pride from the circumstance; I abhor a bully; I would hang a robber. I spit upon "manifest destiny." I despise that Anglo-Saxon courage and energy which is still for war, war without end, and cries peace, peace, when it meets its match; and on the whole I could find quite as much to say for the great Panslavic ides of Eastern Europe as for this Anglo-Saxon humbug which England, of late years, has been trying to cram down me with. I would have the British public,